DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 306 TM 012 103

AUTHOR	Amsler, Mary; And Others
TITLE	An Evaluation of the Utah Career Ladder System.
INSTITUTION	Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.; Utah State Office of Education, Salt Lake City.
PUB DATE	Jan 88
CONTRACT	0377-01-01; OERI-400-86-0009
NOTE	178p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Career Ladders; Elementary Secondary Education; Mail Surveys; Merit Pay; Principals; *Professional Development; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Improvement; Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS	Telephone Surveys; *Utah Career Ladder System

ABSTRACT

The Utah Career Ladder System was evaluated, in an effort to provide policy options for Phase II of the Career Ladder implementation in Utah and present policy recommendations. Five major data collection efforts were made: (1) analysis of district career ladder plans from 1985-86 through 1987-88; (2) a telephone survey of Utah's 40 superintendents and school board presidents; (3) a mail survey of all principals (response rate of 68%) and a random sample of 1,500 teachers (response rate of 63%); (4) a fiscal analysis of teacher salary distribution in 10 districts employing 12,817 teachers; and (5) case studies of career ladder implementation in 12 districts. Strong support was found from superintendents, principals, and teachers for continuing the system. Teacher compensation was being differentiated on the basis of teaching excellence and responsibilities. The single greatest effect of the system was more frequent and effective evaluations. Twelve tables complement the text. Appendices include tabulated survey findings and the research instruments. (SLD)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED299306

AN EVALUATION OF THE UTAH CAREER LADDER SYSTEM

Mary Amsler
Douglas Mitchell
Linda Nelson
Thomas Timar

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MARY AMSLER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

January, 1988

TM 012 103

FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1855 Folsom Street, San Francisco, California 94103 (415) 565-3000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AN EVALUATION OF THE UTAH CAREER LADDER SYSTEM

Mary Amsler
Douglas Mitchell
Linda Nelson
Thomas Timar

This evaluation was funded by the Utah State Office of Education under contract with Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (Contract Number 0377-01-01). Partial support was also provided by Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education (Contract Number 400-86-0009). The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Utah State Office of Education or the U.S. Department of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 3

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY 4

METHODOLOGY 9

CAREER LADDER POLICY DESIGN 13

- Extended Contract Year 13
- Job Enlargement 15
- Performance Bonus 17
- Career Ladder Levels 20

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS 23

- Support for the Career Ladder System 23
- Salary Allocation 27
- Teacher Evaluation 32
- Teacher Professionalism 35
- Organizational Effectiveness 38
- District Implementation 38

CAREER LADDER POLICY OPTIONS 48

The Conceptual Model: The Career Ladder System as a Policy Intervention 48

Five Alternatives for Refining and Expanding the System 50
1. Managing Teacher Performance 50
2. Continuing Support for Teacher Evaluation 52
3. Controlling Salary Effects 53
4. Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness 54
5. Supporting District Implementation 58

Policy Recommendations 60

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Superintendent and Board President Telephone Survey Data 62
Appendix B - Teacher and Principal Survey Data 73
Appendix C - Case Studies Data 109
Appendix D - Research Instruments 132

LIST OF TABLES IN SUMMARY

Table 1: **Global Assessment of the Career Ladder System**

Table 2: **Salary Distribution among Utah Teachers**

Table 2a: **Histogram of Frequencies of Total Career Ladder System Payments**

Table 3: **Participation in Career Ladder Performance Bonus and Levels Components**

Table 4: **The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding Evaluation**

Table 5: **The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding Performance Bonus**

Table 6: **The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding Extended Contract Opportunities**

Table 7: **The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding Job Enlargement**

Table 8: **The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding Specific School Improvements**

Table 9: **The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Principal's Role**

Table 10: **The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding Work Environment**

Table 11: **The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding Overall School Improvement**

Table 12: **The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding District Implementation Procedures**

LIST OF TABLES IN APPENDIX B

Table B1: Demographics

Table B2: Teacher Benefits from The Career Ladder System

Table B3: Criteria Used to Place Teachers on Career Ladders

Table B4: Reported Uses of Extended Contract Year Days

Table B5: Reported Uses of Job Enlargement Tasks

Table B6: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Effectiveness of the Career Ladder System

Table B7: The Views of Teachers Regarding Work Role Changes

Table B8: The Views of Principals Regarding Work Role Changes

Table B9: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding School Improvement

Table B10: The Global Assessment of The Career Ladder Systems

Table B11: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding Extended Contract Opportunities for Teachers

Table B12: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Contribution of Extended Contract to Principal Effectiveness

Table B13: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Contribution of the Extended Contract to District Effectiveness

Table B14: Global Assessment of the Extended Contract Component

Table B15: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Performance Bonus Component as an Effective Teacher Incentive

Table B16: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Contribution of the Performance Bonus to Principal Effectiveness

Table B17: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Contribution of the Performance Bonus to District Effectiveness

Table B18: Global Assessment of the Performance Bonus Component

Table B19: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding Job Enlargement as an Effective Teacher Incentive

Table B20: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Contribution of Job Enlargement to Principal Effectiveness

Table B21: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Contribution of Job Enlargement to District Effectiveness

Table B22: Global Assessment of the Job Enlargement Component

Table B23: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding Career Ladder Levels as an Effective Teacher Incentive

Table B24: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Contribution of Career Ladder Levels to Principal Effectiveness

Table B25: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Contribution of Career Ladder Levels to District Effectiveness

Table B26: Global Assessment of the Career Ladder Levels

Table B27: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding Procedural Fairness in Their Districts

Table B28: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding District Provision of Application Forms and Information

Table B29: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Most Valuable of the CLS Components

Table B30: The Views of Principals and Teachers Regarding the Least Valuable of the CLS Components

INTRODUCTION

> We hated Career Ladders at first. But we worked very hard to make sense out of the plan....Finally, we're seeing the benefits. I would be heartsick if it were to disappear now. **Teacher**

> You're asking me four years later whether or not it's worth it. I have to tell you I'm glad you waited. I can now say emphatically that it is. If you had asked me on a bad day in year two, I would have pleaded for your help in making it go away.
> **Principal**

> What would I tell the legislature? I think it's probably the best piece of legislation they have passed on reform....however we got here - we're here...and schools are better...and students [better served] because of it.
> **Superintendent**

In 1983, the Utah State Legislature, with support from the State Office of Education, adopted a state-wide teacher Career Ladder System (CLS). The purpose of the legislation was twofold: to attract and retain good teachers, and to improve the quality of schools in Utah. The career ladder approach was one supported by much of the education reform literature of the early 1980s. Educational leaders called for improvements in the quality of the teacher work force and expansion of the work responsibilities of teachers in schools as an important step toward the overall improvement of K-12 education. Greater financial and career incentives to keep good teachers in the classroom, more and better teacher evaluations to improve the quality of teaching, and better use of teacher talents outside the classroom were strategies considered essential for school reform.

Utah's Career Ladder legislation structured these recommendations into a five-component statewide teacher compensation system. Two components of the system allow districts to pay teachers for work beyond the regular contract year. Through three other components, teachers can be paid for expanded job responsibilities and qualitatively better teaching during the regular school year. From district to district, the results of Career Ladder implementation have been mixed, with some districts benefiting greatly from the policy, while others are obviously struggling with attempts to follow the guidelines. In discussing the policy, both proponents and critics of the

Career Ladder System focus on the merit pay aspects of the legislation and describe legislative intent as aimed at weeding out poor teachers while rewarding the few best ones. A generally held view is that the five component structure is an overly complex by-product of political bargaining needed to gain support for combining school reform with some form of performance or merit-based teacher compensation.

That the policy is controversial is not surprising, particularly in light of its far-reaching impact. Every teacher, principal, school and district in the state feels its effects. Yet it is precisely the policy's effectiveness in changing long-entrenched systems of work and pay that provokes such strong feelings. **An analysis of Career Ladders throughout Utah reveals that, in spite of the controversy, the policy is powerfully and positively changing both the teaching profession and the ways schools are organized to teach students.** Utah's Career Ladder System is a model that deserves national attention.

BACKGROUND

In June, 1987, the Utah State Office of Education requested that Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development conduct an evaluation of its Career Ladder System. The purpose was to provide Utah's policy leaders with an assessment of the overall impact of the Career Ladder System in Utah schools, and to develop recommendations for oversight of the next phase of the policy's implementation. To evaluate statewide effects, Far West Laboratory researchers conducted five major data collection efforts:

- a content analysis of district Career Ladder Plans from the 1985-86 through the 1987-88 school years,
- a telephone survey of the state's 40 superintendents and school board presidents,
- a mail survey of all principals in the state and a random sample of 1500 teachers -- The principal survey response rate is 68 percent; teacher response rate is 63 percent,
- a fiscal analysis of teacher salary distribution in ten districts employing 12,817 teachers, representing over two-thirds of teachers in the state, and
- case studies of the Career Ladder's implementation in 12 districts selected by variables of size, geographic location, and variation in funding patterns.

This report summarizes the information collected from these efforts, provides policy options for Phase II of Career Ladder implementation in Utah and presents policy recommendations. The appendices include further findings from the telephone surveys, mail surveys, case studies. The research instruments used for the study are also included.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE UTAH CAREER LADDER PROGRAM

In response to the publication of A Nation At Risk in 1983, Governor Scott M. Matheson in cooperation with Utah legislative leadership formed the Utah Education Reform Steering Committee in the spring of 1983. The eleven member Committee was charged with developing specific recommendations for the improvement of elementary and secondary education and higher education within the state.

The Committee held a series of meetings in the spring and summer and commissioned a major public opinion poll of citizens' views concerning the quality of education in the state. Their 48 page report entitled "Education in Utah: A Call to Action" was released to the public on November 11, 1983. It includes specific recommendations for the reform of education in the areas of Public Education, Higher Education and Facilities, and Growth and Productivity. The recommendations for teachers includes:

- a four level career "ladder" for teachers, emphasizing promotion based on performance and with increased responsibility and pay at each level,
- extension of all teachers' contracts by an average of 12 days, the extra days to be used for activities which normally interfere with class time,
- reform of teacher education through increased cooperation between public and higher education.

The Committee calculated that the entire reform effort would cost $150.6 million: $71.4 million for reforms, and $ 79.2 million to maintain the existing programs in the face of rising enrollments and inflation. Of this total, elementary and secondary would receive $109.6 million of the total and higher education would receive $41 million. The Committee recommended alternative ways to raise the $110 million from new taxes.

In response to public meetings held by the Committee to survey public opinion in eleven cities throughout the state as well as the reactions from professional organizations and citizens, the Committee issued an Addendum to the report in January of 1984. It clarified and extended the report's recommendations as well as responding to calls for local initiative and greater flexibility in implementing the Committee's proposals.

The Addendum to "Education in Utah: A Call to Action" recommended that the Legislature authorize and fund a program which would allow local districts to establish their own career ladders. District participation would be voluntary. Each district that wanted to participate would be asked to submit a plan to the State Board of Education consistent with principles established by the Legislature. Specific guidelines for applying the principles would be developed by the State Board of Education.

The Addendum defines the elements of a career ladder through specific elements:

- A beginning teacher level at which a new teacher remains for a minimum of two and a maximum of three years. The principal and an assisting teacher would provide systematic supervision. A team in each district is responsible for teacher performance at the end of each year.

- A minimum of two additional career levels above the beginning teacher level. Promotion is based on evaluation of performance as well as education and experience.

- The primary responsibility of teachers at all levels is classroom instruction. Non-instructional responsibilities are not required for advancement.

- Annual increases in pay, like promotion on the Career Ladder, are based on a mix of factors including performance. The present system of uniform, automatic increments would be modified to provide for variable increments based on evaluation of performance as well as education and experience.

- Evaluation should be regular, consistent and fair. The basic principles for professional staff evaluation procedures are to be established. Each district develops its own implementation plan.

The Addendum also addresses compensation and length of the contact year. The Committee recommended an average contract year of 192 days in each district. It also recommended the development of a contract system which would allow teachers willing to accept additional responsibilities to be offered extended contracts.

The Legislation

In response to "Education in Utah: A Call to Action" as well as the national movement to reform education, the Utah State Legislature enacted H.B. 110 in February of 1984, effective July 1, 1984.

The general legislative feeling was there was a need to do something to reform education, but there was no agreement about what to do. Two bills were presented to the legislature. Representative Kim Burningham was the major sponsor of one bill; Representative Bob Garff was the major sponsor of the second. Representatives Garff, Burningham and Frandsen worked out a compromise. Once the compromise legislation reached the floor, it was amended so the mandatory guidelines for district proposals were changed to advisory guidelines. The general consensus in the Legislature was to give the districts and the State Board of Education broad general guidelines and to allow the districts to develop their own programs and evaluation procedures. H.B. 110 therefore emphasized local development rather than a mandated state-wide system.

The first section of HB 110 (53-54-1) states four Legislative concerns:

1. the need to reward teaching excellence
2. the importance of providing incentives for educators to continue to pursue excellence
3. the rewarding of educators who demonstrate achievement
4. the compensation of educators who assume additional educational responsibilities

Section two (53-54-2) defines Career Ladders as a compensation system developed by a school district with input from parents, teachers and school administrators. It also broadly defines "evaluation system" as a procedure developed by the district to provide periodic, fair, objective and consistent evaluation of educator performance.

Section three (53-54-3) broadly describes different components Career Ladders would include such as extended contract days, additional pay for additional performance, fair selection procedures for job enlargement activities, differentiated staffing, a clearly defined evaluation system, criteria for advancement on the Career Ladder Program and a plan for the periodic review of the Career Ladder System.

Section four (53-54-4) states that each district must develop an evaluation procedure for placement and advancement on the Career Ladder levels which incorporates specific job descriptions.

Section five (53-54-5) gives the State Board of Education authority to approve district plans and to provide the funding for approved plans. In this last section of the bill, the Legislature mandated that 50 percent of the funds be spent on salary increases for advancement on career ladder levels under Subsection 53-54-3(7) based upon an evaluation of teaching performance.

HB 110 authorizes the Career Ladder System. The School Finance Bill that included the appropriation did not initially pass the budget session. In the subsequent special session, provisions for $15 million were made available. The full costs of the program were originally projected to be $109.6 million.

In the 1985-86 legislative session two amendments were passed. Senate Bill 291 was concerned with performance bonus and teacher shortages. Under this legislation each district is required to spend at least 10 percent of the total district allocation under Subsection 53-54-2 for performance bonuses to teachers. It also requires that teacher and parent representatives be included in the formulation of the district evaluation system.

Under the same legislation districts with teacher shortages are authorized to allocate up to $1 million to hire teachers in shortage areas. Career Ladder funds may be used an incentive to bring teachers into curriculum areas where no district expertise exists.

Senate Bill 14 defines "educator" or "teacher" to be certificated personnel who are paid on the teacher's salary scale and whose primary function is to provide instructional and/or counseling services to students in the public schools.

In 1985-86 the funding level was doubled to $30,169,030. In 1986-87, the funding level was further increased to $34,332,300.

In 1986-87, Senate Bill 100 mandated a systematic evaluation system for all teachers in the Utah public schools. Evaluation became a state mandated requirement, no longer a district level requirement integrated into the career ladder program.

Implementation

During the first year (1983-84) of the Career Ladder System, implementation was hampered by time constraints. The State Board of Education had from March to June to develop the state board standards, deliver them to the districts, and to develop procedures for evaluating district plans. In turn, the districts had only five months to both develop a district plan and to implement a planning process and procedures which would include the participation of teachers, administrators, and parents. Despite these tight time schedules all 40 districts had plans approved by Fall, 1984.

The funding for the Career Ladder components was provided by the State Board of Education during the first year in response to legislative mandate. House Bill 110 required that at least 50 percent of the funds appropriated be directed to advancement on career ladders. This included the components of the vertical dimension of the Career Ladder System: performance bonus, the career ladder levels and job enlargement. The Utah Education Association lobbied vigorously for a commitment of 50 percent of the funds for the Extended Contract Year under the horizontal level. House Bill 110 committed 50 percent of the funds to this component. The funding formula was changed during the Legislative Session of 1985-86 to require 10 percent of the funds to the Performance Bonus component.

Initially, there was no standardized format for the districts to follow. Because the legislation language was general, the first year was spent in the clarification of the intent of the bill and the development of state standards. Districts developed their own plans -- some in great detail and others only in vague outline form. The State Department of Education in its role of administering state appropriations for career ladders was required to approve district plans for funding. During the first year, the agency chose to focus on the components of Job Enlargement and Performance Bonus because they were easier to implement and regulate. The ladder levels were not strictly evaluated until the second year of the program after districts had the opportunity to more fully develop and implement effective district plans.

The State Department of Education proposed a series of strategies to facilitate the implementation process for the districts. The Department provided technical support directly to the districts. A staff member was assigned to each district to help it in the implementation process. Staff were available to answer questions, clarify legislative intent, and develop linkages among the districts.

The State Department of Education also organized a Career Ladder Conference after the 85-86 legislative session for districts to share plans directly with each other. Six district team members were funded by the State Department of Education to attend the conference. These meetings have been continued annually to serve as an exchange forum for districts as they change the design of their district plans to respond to changing district and state needs.

Each year since the initial legislation in 1984, the State Board of Education has developed further procedures to standardize the format of the district career ladder plans. This standard format follows HB-110 (1984), SB-291 and SB-14 and the Career Ladder Standards and Guidelines developed by the Board. The Department wants to develop a format which will allow the systematic collection of data without the removal of district autonomy.

METHODOLOGY

The legislative intent of the Career Ladder System was to give school administrators control over marginal resources which they could marshall to improve teacher and, more generally, organizational performance. Consequently, this policy study focuses on the relationship between the Career Ladder System and the promulgation of effective school practices. This study will describe the conditions and circumstances that strengthen the connection between school improvement and the Career Ladder System as well as those that obstruct that connection. To that end, this study will address the following questions:

1. What variables frame district and school responses to the career ladder system?
2. What are various modes of program implementation and how do they relate to program effectiveness? How do they differ for teachers and administrators?
3. How do the four career ladder program components differ in their capacity to promote effective school practices?

The study of Utah's Career Ladder System will develop three levels of analysis: (1) general responses by teachers, administrators, school board members and parents to the perceived purposes and effects of the program; (2) a micro-economic analysis of the distribution of career ladder funds among teachers; and (3) the Career Ladder System as a state school reform measure that improves overall school effectiveness.

1. RESPONSES TO THE GENERAL PURPOSES AND EFFECTS OF THE CAREER LADDER SYSTEM

Questions at this level ask whether those individuals most directly affected by the program -- teachers and administrators -- are satisfied with its implementation and operation. Are those affected supportive? If so, are they supportive of all elements of the CLS, or do they prefer some or one over others? What elements of the CLS do they dislike, find unworkable, and/or counter-productive? Does the CLS serve as an incentive and reward system or as a screening device?

Answers to these questions are based on the telephone surveys of superintendents and board presidents and mail surveys to teachers and principals. Information from the case studies allowed validation and refinement to these responses.

2. MICRO-ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF CAREER LADDER FUNDS

In this section, we examine the distribution of state career ladder system funding to teachers according to program components. This answers the policy question: What proportion of teachers in districts received career ladder monies and what was the distribution of those monies among career ladder components. There are two lines of analysis: (1) how much money did teachers in selected districts receive in various bonuses in addition to their regular salaries; and (2) what was the distribution of funds to teachers based on the four career ladder components.

This analysis is based on the sample districts which were selected for case study.

3. THE CLS AS A VEHICLE FOR IMPROVING SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

At this level, evaluation focuses on the capacity of Utah's Career Ladder System to prompt school improvement on two dimensions:

- by providing school administrators with a set of managerial tools to improve school effectiveness,
- by providing teachers with opportunities for professional growth and development,

Questions at this level of analysis ask whether the CLS gives school administrators necessary resources and sufficient latitude to make significant organizational improvements. If so, what forms do such improvements take? Are there differences among districts in their utilization of these management tools? What is the cause of such variation? And are there differences among the career ladder system components that make them more or less effective tools for school improvement.

Information for this portion of the study is based upon the telephone and mail surveys, but relies mostly on information obtained from the district case studies.

A Note on Student Achievement

While the expectations of state policymakers -- that the Career Ladder System will improve student performance state wide -- are reasonable, its measurement is not possible. Consequently, this study will not address the direct relationship between the Career Ladder System and increased student achievement. There is no methodology available that would allow researchers to isolate the unique effects of the Career Ladder

System from other factors that influence student achievement. There is no baseline against which comparisons could be made; and existing measures of student performance, such as SAT, ACT and other norm-referenced achievement tests, are not reliable indicators of school performance. In the past, when policymakers in other states have attempted to attribute increased student achievement to unique program effects, they have generally been discredited. There are simply not enough control variables to allow researchers to isolate the unique effects of a particular program from a host of other factors that influence student academic progress.

In lieu of direct student achievement data, this study focuses, instead, on the indirect effects of the Career Ladder System on student achievement. This policy study assesses the capacity of the Career Ladder System to mobilize school reform efforts throughout the state. The policy question that we address is: To what extent and under what circumstances does the Career Ladder System become a vehicle for overall school improvement efforts and how do those efforts relate to increased effectiveness and performance. This approach allows policymakers to take in a richer view of the various effects of the Career Ladder System and to gain a better understanding of the ways in which the Career Ladder System can influence organizational behavior and performance. From this perspective, the connection between the CLS and student achievement is more easily understood. Rather than trying to measure the aggregate effects of the career ladder system, we measure the various, disaggregated programmatic effects.

That is, we look at the various programs and activities that are generated by the CLS and assess their effects in relation to expectations about organizational and student performance. If, for example, a high school is able to offer, as a result of the CLS, advanced placement courses for its students, we would assume, given sufficient program quality, a positive effect on student learning. Similarly, if the CLS militates for a teachers evaluation system that is a more reliable and accurate measure of teacher performance than existing mechanisms, it is valid to assume that the improvement in teacher evaluation will be manifested in overall school performance.

While no single educational program or instructional strategy can be linked to student achievement, there is considerable evidence to link student achievement to overall school quality. Studies of school effectiveness have shown, unsurprisingly, that schools in which administrators can target resources to needs; in which there is collaborative needs assessment, planning and goal setting; in which teachers have opportunities to develop professionally; in which there is a strong sense of community and commonality of purpose; and in which professional growth, instructional activity, and organizational management are integrated for the purpose of improving institutional competence; have higher rates of student achievement than schools lacking these characteristics. Consequently, in addressing the issue of student achievement, our assessment of the Career Ladder System focuses on the circumstances and conditions where it fosters effective school practices.

THE CAREER LADDER POLICY DESIGN

Because the Career Ladder System is so complex, it is being implemented very differently from district to district. In some, educators are realizing substantial benefits from it and are strong supporters. Other districts have struggled with attempts to follow the guidelines. As a result, they actively work to either evade or subvert its intent and would be happy for the system to disappear entirely. Some might conclude from such mixed results that the policy must be basically flawed. That is not the conclusion of this report, however. There is room for adjustments and redirection of some of the components, the relative success or failure of the system from district to district can be accounted for primarily in the way districts have approached implementation of this massive policy change. Before discussing differences in district implementation that determine the system's impact, and the options available to mitigate differences, a common understanding of the policy design and its effects is needed.

The five components of the Career Ladder System are the Extended Contract Year, Job Enlargement, Performance Bonus, Career Ladder Levels, and Incentive Funding for Teacher Shortage Areas. Because it is used by only a very few districts, the Incentive Funding for Teacher Shortage Areas component has little overall system effects. This report focuses discussion on the first four. Each has very powerful but slightly different effects on schools and teachers.

Extended Contract Year

The Extended Contract Year buys more professional teacher time beyond the regular contract year. Teachers are paid for curriculum planning, student assessment, inservice training and critical clerical tasks that support direct instruction. In some districts, district administrators decide how extra teacher time is used. In others, principals and teachers share the decisionmaking. In still others, teachers control when and how they spend this time.

A number of people involved in the initial legislative bargaining over the design of Utah's policy contend that the Extended Contract Year Component was developed as a political tradeoff aimed at garnering the support of teachers for the overall legislative package. Whether or not this is an accurate description of its initial impetus, its impact on the teaching profession and on schools has been substantial and important. This component is expanding the definition of basic teacher work responsibilities to include activities that, while always associated with good instruction, have been traditionally unpaid and have relied entirely on teachers' personal time commitments for their performance. Buying teacher time beyond their student contact hours (time when students aren't around) has recognized the importance of preparation, making it a part of the routine work of all professional teachers. This component helps to reinforce the professional role of teachers. Like doctors and lawyers, teachers in Utah are now being paid, modestly to be sure, for the crucial preparation necessary to carry out their work.

> I'm doing now what I have always done in order to prepare for the school year. But I feel that, at last, this part of a teacher's work is valued....It also takes away any excuses for not being prepared!
>
> I especially appreciate having paid work time to plan and talk with other teachers while students aren't around....we found ourselves remembering our "wishful thinking days" in the faculty lounge when we talked about how we ought to be working -- and realizing we now had no reason not to work that way! I guess it puts us on the spot to deliver -- but so far we've welcomed the chance.

The Extended Contract Year has produced important school improvement effects. It is almost unanimously valued by teachers, principals, superintendents, board presidents, and parents. Principals and teachers report that they are better prepared for the opening of school. Teachers are able to spend more student-contact time in direct instruction because planning, grade preparation and conferencing time no longer eats into the school day. Principals are able to convene faculty prior to school to set goals and develop school-wide curriculum plans.

A principal notes:

> Now I have the whole staff together before school starts to talk about more than the immediate startup needs. We have time to

> talk about goals for the year and plan special curriculum projects to strengthen the academic program.

Another comments:

> I can't begin to measure the importance of Extended Contracts. The entire system benefits...The work teachers do in class with kids can't occur if we don't pay for planning time. If we want professional teachers, we need to treat them like professionals. Paying only for time in-class is a little like paying the lawyer only for his work at the trial -- not for his time in the law library.

Job Enlargement

Job Enlargement allows districts to pay teachers for short term activities. Like Extended Contract time, it buys more teacher time for schools. It differs from the Extended Contract Year in that it does not pay for the routine work that all teachers undertake. Rather, it pays teachers to expand their work responsibilities in the school. The mentoring of new teachers, curriculum development and service on district-wide instructional committees are the most frequently reported Job Enlargement activities.

Comments a principal:

> With so many beginning teachers this year, I can't imagine what my school would have been like without the mentor teachers helping me. They have prepared the new ones for evaluations and taught them the ropes of the school in a way I simply could not have.

Job Enlargement also differs from the Extended Contract Component in the locus of control over how the time is spent. Teachers have substantial control over Extended Contract time. Administrators at the school and district levels or committees representing teachers and principals generally determine Job Enlargement responsibilities. Consequently, the work can be targeted more directly to specific school and district goals than can work carried out more diffusely by individual teachers under the Extended Contract Year.

> Certainly it's true that Job Enlargement pays teachers for extra work, but 'extra' doesn't begin to capture the importance of

> this component in my school. I can build a leadership team of my best teachers. And believe me, there are no greater advocates for kids... By giving teachers the go-ahead to improve this place -- and paying them for their time so they don't have to run off to another job at the end of the day -- I've seen more curriculum improvement and attention to special needs of students in three years than I would have expected to be able to pull off without Job Enlargement in maybe five -- very long -- years. Principal

Job Enlargement is a crucial ingredient in the overall success of the Career Ladder System. It provides districts with a sort of 'venture capital' to experiment with new ways of using teacher talent to improve schools. As such, Job Enlargement promotes system-wide innovation: it enables schools to clarify what kinds of roles ought to be folded into the routine work of senior teachers as they advance in the profession, and which are appropriate short term "piece-work" tasks that, though necessary, cannot and should not be institutionalized.

> ...we have struggled as a group trying to figure out just what jobs are the most important. But I think the committee has been fair in balancing school needs vs. district needs. Sure it's extra pay for extra work, but its for work that has needed to be done. Teacher

Job Enlargement also has disadvantages for teachers. Because Job Enlargement positions are temporary -- from one to three years generally -- the extra pay for teachers is temporary. It is not a kind of compensation that teachers can count on for long term financial planning.

> I can't assure my bank that this money will continue, so I'm not able to use it for credit purposes....

A number of teachers value the temporary nature of Job Enlargement assignments. They view it as allowing them to work very hard for two or three years in an area of specialty without needing to take on expanded duties permanently. Representative of these teachers is this teacher's observation:

> I'm a long-time critic of our 'piecemeal' and 'egocentric' curriculum. Suddenly, Job Enlargement paid me and some other curriculum critics to put our ideas into operation: sort of 'put up or shut up'.

> We put up. Believe me, I've worked harder than I would have imagined with teaching and working on our curriculum plan. But it's been worth it. After another year, I can go back to the classroom satisfied that my day-to-day work in some way relates to the work of the other teachers in the school..
>
> But I have to admit I'll be ready to go back to my classroom. There is no question I needed that extra money as incentive to do the kind of the curriculum planning we needed. Now, I'm confident we 're all working on common goals - and I'm ready to go back to my regular salary and regular classroom duties.

Performance Bonus

This component is designed to improve the quality of teaching by paying bonuses to teachers rated as the best in the school or district. Teachers qualify for a bonus generally through a positive principal evaluation supplemented by additional lines of evidence that verify excellent practice. Typically, evaluation scores awarded for the various lines of evidence are ranked and those teachers with the top scores receive extra pay. Bonus amounts and criteria for making the award are determined by the district.

The Performance Bonus is the most controversial and least well-implemented of the four components. But it is not without its supporters among both principals and teachers. The bonus' greatest benefit has been to focus teacher and principal attention on teacher evaluation. By requiring principals to systematically evaluate teachers, it has served in some schools to reinstate the principal as the instructional leader. In others, traditionally collegial principal-teacher working relationships have been fractured by the need to fill a small quota of bonus positions from a much larger pool of teachers considered excellent by both the principal and their peers.

> I didn't apply. I know I'm a good teacher. In fact, my principal encouraged me to apply. but why should I risk the envy of my friends and colleagues for $200. For all I know, it will disappear anyway next year, but I'll still be working here with these people. **Teacher**

The problems and very strong feelings associated with it stem in part from controversy over the validity of the concept of merit pay as a school improvement vehicle. Those who do not support bonuses question their validity, and document the consequent negative effects on teacher morale and school climate which can ultimately threaten the quality of students' education. In schools where evaluation has not been consistently conducted, some teachers aren't convinced that the training provided principals is enough to ensure fair and reliable evaluations; neither are some principals.

> I know what it says on paper. We are awarded bonuses based on some sort of scientific evaluation. Well, my evaluation consisted of a 15 minute observation, unannounced, with a five minute feedback session. I remember being told I was basically ok but not bonus material....later I noticed who was...I could have predicted it. Bonuses went to the principal's favorites. Maybe I'm not in the top 10 percent, but I know teachers who are who didn't get extra pay. These things pay off for political savvy not for how hard you work for kids.
>
> I was told I could award five bonuses. Well, maybe not all my teachers deserved one this year, but far more than five did outstanding work. The tensions around who gets it are terrific. It has taken a toll on the morale of my staff. The ones who actually receive the money keep it quiet. That doesn't make it a reward. It's a punishment... all for $150!

Teacher and principal uncertainty about the reliability and validity of evaluation would seem to be justified. Judging teacher performance remains uncertain. The Educational Testing Service, nationally recognized as a leader in testing, is just now in the process of developing a new National Teachers Exam to assess the skills needed for teaching. Advance commentary about this test points out that the exam will look different from previous teacher competency exams. Connecticut and California, among others, are developing new teacher licensure examinations, and the Carnegie Corporation has contracted a team of experts to develop prototypes for a certification exam for teachers. With expert understanding of the factors that verify excellent teaching so tentative, it makes sense that teachers, who are well aware of the limits of evaluation instruments in accurately judging student potential, balk at their use in determining teachers' relative professional worth.

In the case of Performance Bonuses, case study data help to flesh out understanding of this component. First, it is evident that some districts are using the Performance Bonus very effectively to promote better teaching, and others have suffered serious morale problems by attempting to carry out the letter of the legislation.

> The training we received was terrific. Now, throughout the school and the district we talk about our work in the same terms. We have a common language for discussing problems, lesson development, neat curriculum plans. I wouldn't have believed it, but I think it's made us all better and more professional teachers. Teachers

Second,it is evident that the districts which have successfully used this component have worked out a way to preserve the legitimacy of the award while ensuring that all good teachers get rewarded. Educators in these districts found effective ways to avoid a 'quota' award system -- that is one that predetermines the number of possible bonuses without regard for the actual number of teachers rated excellent. Of the 12 case study districts, those which tried to follow the letter of the law on bonuses suffered the most negative effects in terms of teacher morale, teacher-teacher and teacher-principal tensions, and parent concerns about possible negative effects on students in schools experiencing such upheaval.

This component produces the broadest range of effects of all components: that is, there is considerable difference in impact between districts able to use it effectively and those which have suffered from trying to follow the letter of the guidelines. Bonuses can benignly reward the few best teachers or they can undermine professional communication and trust among teachers and between principals and teachers. They can raise awareness of and attention to evaluation or they can promote political strategizing -- encouraging teachers to keep their best ideas to themselves in hopes of a higher bonus while discouraging teachers from helping one another: the idea being that the few will benefit more by the lack of success of the many.

A principal concern reflective of this effect:

> Whoever thinks this [Performance Bonus] will improve schools is sorely mistaken. I have long-time teachers refusing to talk to others. They think that they'll have a better chance at a bonus if they keep their good ideas to themselves....the bonuses are seriously damaging morale....

Some parents expressed concern about the spillover of negativity on student attitudes. Representative of this parent concern:

> I don't know much about teaching...but we've always been very pleased with our school....as a parent, I can tell the difference just by stopping by the classroom. Teachers seem to feel differently about their work....they're more 'closed' and don't seem to connect with other teachers as much as before....I just worry that students are going to start picking up on their attitudes and start not liking school as much...

Not all comments about bonuses were negative. The evaluation and training associated with it are highly valued by many teachers and principals. Reflective of these attitudes are the following comments:

> The training we received was terrific. Now, throughout the school and the district we talk about our work in the same terms. We have a common language for discussing problems, lesson development, neat curriculum plans. I wouldn't have believed it, but I think it's made us all better and more professional teachers. **Teacher**

> I think my work as a teacher has improved. I actually like having the principal sit down and talk about my work with me. I've been here eight years and haven't had this much quality attention. I hope the requirement stays. **Teacher**

Career Ladder Levels

This component is designed to differentiate teachers' professional status in schools by creating a Career Ladder through which teachers may advance in status, work responsibilities, and pay. The intent is to provide an incentive for excellent teachers to remain in the classroom. It is an antidote to traditional paths for promotion which require teachers to move out of the classroom to gain higher status in the system. Typically, districts have from four to six rungs on the teacher Career Ladder, although the range is from three to seven. The levels are generally differentiated by sustained documentation of excellent teaching performance and expanded work responsibilities in schools. Mentoring and curriculum development are most frequently designated as roles appropriate for senior teachers.

Career Ladders have the potential for making significant long term changes in the structure of the teaching profession because they provide a mechanism to institutionalize broader teacher work responsibilities and expectations of sustained excellence in teacher. Working at their best, ladders advance teachers with higher teaching status and increasingly higher pay not merely because they have stayed around the school long enough or attended enough courses to reach the highest step and lane on the salary chart, but because they have earned advancement through consistently excellent evaluations and proof of their ability to assume broader work roles in the school. The structure of this component is such that both the Performance Bonus and Job Enlargement Components could be subsumed by requirements for ladder advancement.

Unfortunately, while the Career Ladder levels have the most potential for long-term benefits, in the short run this component is most easily sabotaged. It is easy to make ladders look much like steps and lanes. Moreover, much learning is still needed about how to differentiate professional teacher roles in schools. Some districts are well along the path of defining status and responsibility differences. In these, evaluation plays a major role in advancement; and proof of excellent practice is required to remain at a particular level. Expanded responsibilities in the school are gradually increased as teachers move up the ladder, and the kinds of work performed is recognized by teachers and principals as legitimate, necessary work of the school. Other districts have not yet begun or have a system so like a step and lane scale that figuring out whether its a ladder or a lane advance is difficult.

> I admit I thought that the dossiers and lines of evidence were a bit too much like hoop-jumping. But I learn a lot from putting together my dossier ... and I learned that my students and parents like my work. I realize I deserve to be moving up the ladder. I'm growing as a professional and have earned the rewards. Teacher

> My best teachers are in the upper levels and able to work with me on curriculum planning, supporting new teachers and other school policy areas. With a school this large and with such large classes, I can maintain our excellent programs because of this help. My school would flounder now without the system. We've learned how to use

> it to make the school stronger. To take it away would do much more than take money from teachers. It would reshape -- and weaken -- my whole school. **Principal**

Teachers and administrators working on implementing this component are finding that determining what is accepted for advancement in the profession is complex. Excellent teachers bring a broad range of talents to their work, and it is unclear which aspects of these talents should qualify teachers for advancement. There is little precedent in teaching for figuring out how to compare qualitatively and select substantively the teacher skills appropriate for each ladder rung. Yet, the benefits to schools and teachers in carefully defining appropriate status differences are clear enough in many districts to warrant significant teacher attention. If fact, in at least one case study district, teachers have begun to rework their ladder plans out of concern that the requirements for senior teachers are not stringent enough.

> I think we've worked out a fair system and reasonable lines of evidence for the levels. Teachers are now taking a closer look at our Level V. They aren't sure there is enough differentiation between the third and fifth level. They want that highest level to require the best of the profession... 'what's the best' had not been much of a topic of conversation here before the Career Ladder System. It's effects are much stronger than I would have predicted. **Principal**

Together, the four components of the Career Ladder System create a powerful mechanism for school improvement. The system is changing both individual teacher behavior and the ways schools are organized to define goals, delegate authority, and complete tasks. Survey and case study data that follow document the significant curriculum and instructional improvements resulting directly from this policy. These positive effects can often be traced to individual components: that is, Performance Bonuses focus attention on evaluation, and so forth. However, in evaluating the overall impact of this policy, it is important to understand the interrelatedness of the four components.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

The complexity and power of the Career legislation is apparent in the strong bimodal responses of teachers and principals on surveys: teachers and principals either love or hate the CLS, but the policy has not been evaded. There is ample evidence that districts have devoted considerable effort to figuring out how to implement the policy.

An analysis of findings points to six major Career Ladder effects:

1. SUPPORT FOR THE CAREER LADDER SYSTEM: There is broad support for continuing the Career Ladder System among superintendents, principals and teachers in Utah.

2. SALARY ALLOCATION: The Career Ladder System is differentiating teacher compensation on the basis of teaching excellence and expanded work responsibilities.

3. TEACHER EVALUATION: The Career Ladder System focuses teacher and principal attention on teacher evaluation. More frequent and effective teacher evaluations is the single greatest effect of the Career Ladder System.

4. TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM: The role of the professional teacher is expanding. There is a redefinition of teaching responsibilities. Teachers are paid for doing more work and better work.

5. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT: The Career Ladder System provides principals with a powerful mechanism for initiating school improvement activities. The policy is creating a more positive learning climate for students by using the skills of teachers more effectively on behalf of students.

6. DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION: District implementation varies. This variation accounts for much of the teacher and principal criticism of the policy, as well as for the positive support. The negativity is a problem of implementation and not of policy design.

1. LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR THE CAREER LADDER SYSTEM

Educators throughout Utah strongly support retention of the Career Ladder System.

- o Ninety-five percent of superintendents strongly agree that the system should continue. Four percent are supportive of the program if regulatory adjustments are made in one or more component.

- Ninety percent of school board presidents agree that it should be continued. Those who do not support the concept generally hold back full support for two reasons: they are concerned about implementation difficulties or about trade-offs between funding for Career Ladders and for Weighted Pupil Units. One board president's comment typifies the latter concerns:

  > It's hard to totally support ladders when we're so desperate for money for the whole system... I support money for teachers -- I just wish there were more for the rest of the system costs.

  (See Appendix A for further discussion of Superintendent and Board President Surveys)

- Teacher and Principal survey responses indicate strong agreement that the Career Ladder System should continue. Table 1 depicts the agreement among principals and teachers on the four components.

  Ranking of Components by Teachers and Principals

  1. Extended Contract Year is most valued component.
  2. Job Enlargement
  3. Career Ladder Levels
  4. Performance Bonus is most controversial component.

  (See Appendix B for further discussion of Teacher and Principal Surveys)

Case study findings amplify strong support for continuance of the Career Ladders System. In all 12 districts, educators indicated agreement with this ranking of the components. The Extended Day support is extremely strong. As one principal noted, "The Extended Contract Year is the difference between mediocre education and excellence, as far as I'm concerned."

A frequently heard teacher response is:

> It used to be that the term ended on a Friday and grades were due in the office on Monday. I had a choice of a lost weekend for my family or to quit teaching earlier in order to find time to finish grading end of term papers and calculate grades. With a day between terms,

Table 1: Global Assessment of the Career Ladder System Components*

The Components.		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
47. The Extended Contract Component.	Disagree	2.9 *	4.34	5.1 **	4.36
		3.1 *		3.0 *	
	Neutral	9.4 ***		9.7 ***	
		25.9 ********		15.6 *****	
	Agree	58.7 **************		66.6 **************	
34. The total Career Ladder System.	Disagree	8.8 ***	3.85	19.6 ******	3.46
		6.5 **		9.3 ***	
	Neutral	16.8 *****		14.9 ****	
		27.0 ********		17.7 *****	
	Agree	40.9 ************		38.5 ************	
74. The Job Enlargement Component.	Disagree	4.2 *	4.08	13.0 ****	3.55
		6.3 **		6.5 **	
	Neutral	13.3 ****		24.6 *******	
		29.6 *********		24.1 *******	
	Agree	46.6 **************		31.8 **********	
90. The Career Ladder Levels Component.	Disagree	9.2 ***	3.64	18.0 *****	3.39
		10.9 ***		10.6 ***	
	Neutral	20.3 ******		18.4 ******	
		26.1 ********		20.8 ******	
	Agree	33.5 **********		32.2 **********	
59. The Performance Bonus Component.	Disagree	15.9 *****	3.44	24.5 *******	3.20
		10.6 ***		9.3 ***	
	Neutral	19.5 ******		17.8 *****	
		21.6 ******		18.4 ******	
	Agree	32.4 **********		30.0 *********	

*Survey responses to the questions: "The Career Ladder System should be continued..." "[The Component] should be continued..."

> I can be much more deliberate about each student's grade, and I can teach right up to the end of the term.

A principal comment on Job Enlargement:

> Certainly it's true that Job Enlargement pays teachers for extra work, but 'extra' doesn't begin to capture the importance of this component in my school. I can build a leadership team of my best teachers. And believe me, there are no greater advocates for kids... By giving teachers the go-ahead to improve this place - and paying them for their time so they don't have to run off to another job at the end of the day - I've seen more curriculum improvement and attention to special needs of students in three years than I would have expected to be able to pull off without Job Enlargement in maybe five -- very long -- years.

The newness of Job Enlargement kinds of work is evident in this teacher's observation:

> We still have questions about how effectively we're identifying these jobs. We also haven't worked out a [Job Enlargement] evaluation system that we're completely satisfied with. But since the jobs are making our programs stronger and providing students with more help and more AP courses, we're willing to put in the extra time figuring out how to do it right.

The value of Career Ladders is reported as follows by one principal:

> To take it away would do much more than take money from teachers. It would reshape -- and weaken -- my whole school.

Teachers are learning to see a value in ladders as different from step and lane advancement.

> I admit I thought that the dossiers and lines of evidence were a bit too much like hoop-jumping. But I learned a lot from putting together my dossier. I realize I deserve to be moving up the ladder. I'm growing as a professional and have earned the rewards.

(See Appendix C for further
discussion of the case
studies)

2. SALARY ALLOCATION

The Career Ladder System is producing a very substantial reallocation of teacher salaries across the state. Fiscal analysis of data provided by ten districts representing over two-thirds of Utah's teachers document sharp differences in the amount of money earned through each of the components. Tables 2, 2A, and 3 show the salary allocations of Career Ladder funds for the 1986-1987 school year.

Table 2 reports the average amount of money earned through each Career Ladder System component. These figures cover more than 12,800 teachers. According to the data, an individual teacher earning the average base salary of $ 23,054 supplemented that income by approximately seven percent ($1,689) in 1986-87 by participating in all four Career Ladder components. At this salary level he/she would have earned $772 under the Extended Contract Year Component, and just $146 as a Performance Bonus. Those who actually received Performance Bonuses typically received much larger amounts -- the largest group (1,191) received between $600 and $700 in bonus payments.

In fact, the amount of money earned by teachers in all components varied substantially in both dollar amounts and as a percentage of individual base salaries. The differences represent local district choices about how to allocate Career Ladder funds. As shown in Table 2A, total CLS income was broadly distributed. Only one-quarter of one percent of the teaching workforce received no money at all from this program. At the other end of the spectrum, nine individuals collected more than $7,000 in CLS payments (two of these nine were supported under the teacher shortage provision of the policy). The median CLS income (separating the top 50 percent from the lowest 50 percent) was $1,574.40, a bit below the $1,689 average payment. The lowest 15 percent of the teachers in our sample received less than $700 while the top 17 percent received more than $2,700 - leaving a gap of more than $2000. Nearly 10 percent of their annual salary is separating the 15th and 85th percentile groups. Nearly one percent of the teaching workforce received more than $5,000 in CLS payments.

Table 3 shows the percentage of eligible teachers who received Career Ladder funding through Performance Bonuses and Ladder Levels.

Table 2: Salary Distribution among Utah Teachers

(Based on a sample of 12,817 Teachers
in Ten Utah Districts)

	Average	Std. Dev.
Base salary	$23,054.00	$5,184.71
Extended Contract Compensation:	$771.72	$425.41
(percent of base)	3.65%	1.52%
Career Ladder Levels Payments:	362.73	562.63
(percent of base)	1.39	2.44
Performance Bonus Payments:	146.40	295.76
(percent of base)	.77	1.37
Job Enlargement Payments:	402.00	686.42
(percent of base)	1.21	2.67
Average total Career Ladder Payments:	$1,688.86	$1,125.34
(percent of base)	7.06%	4.18%

Median Salary Payment:
$1,574.40

15% of all teachers received less than $700.
17% of all teachers received more than $2,700.
1% of all teachers received more than $5,000.
.07% (nine) teachers recieved more than $7,000.

Table 2A: The Total of All Career Ladder System Payments

Amount rounded	No. of Tchrs	Pct.	Histogram showing frequency for each amount
$0	36	.28%	***
$100	32	.25%	**
$200	86	.67%	******
$300	149	1.16%	**********
$400	433	3.38%	******************************
$500	243	1.90%	*****************
$600	919	7.18%	**
$700	875	6.83%	***
$800	557	4.35%	***************************************
$900	515	4.02%	************************************
$1,000	683	5.33%	**
$1,100	601	4.69%	**
$1,200	368	2.87%	**************************
$1,300	179	1.40%	*************
$1,400	270	2.11%	*******************
$1,500	264	2.06%	******************
$1,600	252	1.97%	******************
$1,700	308	2.40%	**********************
$1,800	370	2.89%	**************************
$1,900	419	3.27%	*****************************
$2,000	353	2.76%	*************************
$2,100	427	3.33%	******************************
$2,200	362	2.83%	*************************
$2,300	244	1.91%	*****************
$2,400	296	2.31%	*********************
$2,500	296	2.31%	*********************
$2,600	412	3.22%	*****************************
$2,700	735	5.74%	***
$2,800	705	5.50%	***
$2,900	150	1.17%	***********
$3,000	175	1.37%	************
$3,100	256	2.00%	******************
$3,200	117	.91%	********
$3,300	81	.63%	******
$3,400	74	.58%	*****
$3,500	48	.37%	***
$3,600	50	.39%	****
$3,700	35	.27%	**
$3,800	61	.48%	****
$3,900	26	.20%	**
$4,000	58	.45%	****
$4,100	17	.13%	*
$4,200	39	.30%	***
$4,300	20	.16%	*
$4,400	18	.14%	*
$4,500	22	.17%	**
$4,600	8	.06%	*

Table 2A: Continued

$4,700	23	.18%	**
$4,800	7	.05%	
$4,900	17	.13%	*
$5,000	6	.05%	
$5,100	12	.09%	*
$5,200	10	.08%	*
$5,300	15	.12%	*
$5,400	16	.12%	*
$5,500	4	.03%	
$5,600	12	.09%	*
$5,700	3	.02%	
$5,800	7	.05%	
$5,900	5	.04%	
$6,000	16	.12%	*
$6,100	1	.01%	
$6,200	2	.02%	
$6,300	0	.00%	
$6,400	0	.00%	
$6,500	4	.03%	
$6,600	1	.01%	
$6,700	0	.00%	
$7,000	2	.02%	

Nine individuals received more than $7,000.

Table 3: Participation in Career Ladder Performance Bonus & Levels Components

Basis of Participation	Number in Sample	Pct
All Teachers	12,817	100.00%
Eligible for Performance Bonuses..........	5,325	41.55% of sample
Awarded Performance Bonuses..........	3,844	72.19% of eligibles
Eligible for lowest Career Ladder Level...	5,486	42.80% of sample
Awarded lowest Career Ladder Level...	4,504	82.10% of eligibles
Eligible for second Career Ladder Level...	3,364	26.25% of sample
Awarded second Career Ladder Level...	2,377	70.66% of eligibles
Eligible for third Career Ladder Level....	343	2.68% of sample
Awarded third Career Ladder Level....	171	49.85% of eligibles

The Performance Bonus allocations show that out of 12,817 teachers in the ten district sample, less than half -- 5,325 -- were eligible for it during the 1986-87 year. The relatively low numbers of eligible teachers may reflect differences in funding options allowed under the 1986-87 guidelines. Of the 3,844 teachers who qualified for bonuses slightly more than 70 percent received one. About 30 percent were selected out and did not receive bonus pay.

The Career Ladder Level compensation figures indicate that not all teachers had moved onto a ladder rung in 1986-87. Of those eligible for level placement, 82 percent were paid on the lowest levels, 71 percent of teachers eligible for a second level received compensation. Only 50 percent of teachers were eligible for the highest level.

Salary effects of this magnitude are unprecedented in recent school district policies throughout the county. While some may argue about whether the most deserving teachers are getting the largest amount of money from this program, there is no doubt that it has had a powerful effect on altering the pattern of teacher compensation throughout the state.

3. TEACHER EVALUATION

Performance Bonus and Career Ladder Levels focus attention on the quality of teaching by requiring periodic teacher evaluations. Tables 4 and 5 display principal and teacher opinion about Performance Bonuses and evaluation. Both principals and teachers report that the CLS's single most powerful effect is this attention to teacher evaluation.

They split, however, on views of whether more evaluation is more effective evaluation. Principals think so. They report that Performance Bonuses, based on evaluations, are effective. Bonuses tend to improve instruction, reward excellence, and clarify understanding of the process. As Table 4 indicates, teachers feel much less strongly that more evaluation means better. They are particularly doubtful that Bonuses ensure fair, consistent evaluations.

> I didn't apply. I know I'm a good teacher. In fact, my principal encouraged me to apply. But why should I risk the envy of my friends and colleagues for $200. For all I know, it will disappear anyway next year, but I'll still be working here with these people.

Table 4. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

The Career Ladder System is effective in providing...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
5. More effective teacher evaluations.	Disagree	6.6 **	3.61	18.8 ******	3.03
		12.2 ****		17.5 *****	
	Neutral	20.2 ******		20.7 ******	
		35.3 ************		28.0 ********	
	Agree	25.7 ********		15.0 *****	

AND

The Performance Bonus effectively helps principals to...

54. Improve instruction in the school	Disagree	7.6 **	3.55	21.8 *******	3.00
		10.3 ***		13.3 ****	
	Neutral	23.0 *******		23.0 *******	
		38.2 ************		27.4 ********	
	Agree	20.9 ******		14.5 ****	
55. Carry out better teacher evaluations.	Disagree	8.7 **	3.55	18.5 ******	3.18
		10.4 ***		12.4 ****	
	Neutral	22.8 *******		21.2 ******	
		35.7 ************		28.2 ********	
	Agree	20.9 ******		19.7 ******	
53. Reward excellent teaching.	Disagree	9.9 ***	3.48	23.3 ******	3.04
		12.3 ****		14.1 ****	
	Neutral	19.0 ******		19.2 ******	
		37.2 ************		26.6 ********	
	Agree	21.6 ******		16.8 *****	

AND

The Performance Bonus effectively allows the district to...

57. Ensure fair teacher evaluations.	Disagree	12.7 ****	3.17	28.5 *********	2.69
		15.7 *****		17.5 *****	
	Neutral	27.1 ********		22.1 *******	
		31.1 *********		20.2 ******	
	Agree	13.4 ****		11.7 ****	
56. Retain excellent teachers.	Disagree	12.0 ****	3.15	27.8 ********	2.72
		16.7 *****		16.3 *****	
	Neutral	29.7 *********		24.5 *******	
		27.8 ********		19.2 ******	
	Agree	13.8 ****		12.2 ****	

Table 5: The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

The Performance Bonus is an incentive for teachers to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
50. Understand teacher evaluation better.	Disagree	8.0 **		19.7 ******	
		10.8 ***		12.1 ****	
	Neutral	20.7 ******	3.54	23.4 *******	3.11
		40.7 ************		27.5 ********	
	Agree	19.8 ******		17.3 *****	
49. Care more about the quality of teaching.	Disagree	7.8 **		23.1 *******	
		13.5 ****		12.3 ****	
	Neutral	24.3 *******	3.43	20.1 ******	3.05
		36.7 ***********		25.2 ********	
	Agree	17.7 *****		19.3 ******	

AND

Career Ladder Levels are incentives for teachers to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
78. Care more about teaching quality	Disagree	3.8 *		18.0 *****	
		12.3 ****		12.8 ****	
	Neutral	27.6 ********	3.53	18.7 ******	3.23
		39.3 ************		29.7 *********	
	Agree	17.0 *****		20.8 ******	
77. Carry out district curriculum objectives.	Disagree	4.5 *		16.0 *****	
		15.3 *****		14.0 ****	
	Neutral	31.0 *********	3.37	28.8 *********	3.10
		37.2 ***********		26.3 ********	
	Agree	12.0 ****		14.9 ****	
75. Improve their teaching skills.	Disagree	5.5 **		18.5 ******	
		16.8 *****		12.5 ****	
	Neutral	30.4 *********	3.32	18.7 ******	3.20
		34.6 **********		31.0 *********	
	Agree	12.7 ****		19.3 ******	
76. Monitor student achievement.	Disagree	4.2 *		16.8 *****	
		16.1 *****		15.2 *****	
	Neutral	37.4 ***********	3.28	24.7 *******	3.10
		32.1 **********		28.3 ********	
	Agree	10.2 ***		15.0 *****	

As a principal said,

> I was told I could award five bonuses. Well, maybe not all my teachers deserved one this year, but far more than five did outstanding work. The tensions around who gets it are terrific. It has taken a toll on the morale of my staff. The ones who actually receive the money keep it quiet. That doesn't make it a reward. It's a punishment ...all for $150!

Teachers view the evaluations associated with ladder levels as better incentive for improving individual teacher's skills. Principals are more confident than teachers that ladders are improving both the quality of individual teacher performance and the instructional program.

A typical comment of a teacher who likes ladders:

> I think my work as a teacher has improved as a result of the ladders and evaluation. I actually like having the principal sit down and talk about my work with me. I've been here eight years and haven't had this much quality attention. I hope the requirement stays.

4. TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM

The Extended Contract Year and Job Enlargement Components are expanding the role definition of a professional teacher in Utah. Table 6 shows the high regard for Extended Day Contract time. It acts as an incentive for teachers to plan, develop curriculum, and improve their professional skills. Both groups see it as essential to the delivery of direct instruction.

Shown in Table 7, principals and teachers see the Job Enlargement Component as paying for work which previously went unpaid. But it is also moving teachers into school leadership roles, allowing them to put their professional skills to more effective use. The range of uses of this component varies considerably from district to district. Some districts recognize only two or three Job Enlargement positions: for example mentor teachers, grade level chairperson, or curriculum specialists. Other districts are realizing the 'venture capital' aspects of this component by experimenting with a wider range of positions: for example, homework hotline staff or school-community relations coordinators.

Table 6: The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

Extended Contract increases teacher opportunities to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
35. Plan for classroom instruction.	Disagree	2.1 *	4.36	3.9 *	4.37
		3.1 *		3.5 *	
	Neutral	5.4 **		7.2 **	
		35.1 ***********		22.9 *******	
	Agree	54.3 **************		62.5 **************	
36. Develop curriculum.	Disagree	2.1 *	4.20	4.0 *	4.23
		3.9 *		4.7 *	
	Neutral	10.8 ***		11.1 ***	
		38.0 ***********		24.4 *******	
	Agree	45.2 **************		55.8 **************	
37. Participate in professional development.	Disagree	1.9 *	4.15	5.2 **	3.95
		3.1 *		7.7 **	
	Neutral	15.1 *****		17.8 *****	
		37.8 ***********		25.4 ********	
	Agree	42.1 *************		43.9 *************	
38. Take care of record-keeping & paperwork.	Disagree	2.9 *	4.07	6.4 **	4.16
		6.9 **		5.2 **	
	Neutral	13.9 ****		10.1 ***	
		32.6 **********		22.6 *******	
	Agree	43.7 *************		55.7 **************	
40. Communicate with parents.	Disagree	4.2 *	3.57	10.9 ***	3.41
		11.0 ***		11.9 ****	
	Neutral	30.8 *********		27.1 ********	
		31.8 **********		25.3 ********	
	Agree	22.2 *******		24.8 *******	
39. Provide additional student instruction.	Disagree	6.4 **	3.41	15.7 *****	3.28
		14.1 ****		14.4 ****	
	Neutral	31.2 *********		21.6 ******	
		28.5 *********		23.3 *******	
	Agree	19.8 ******		25.0 ********	

Table 7: The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

Job Enlargement is an effective incentive for teachers to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
	Disagree	1.9 *		8.0 **	
		2.1 *		4.3 *	
63. Be paid for work they once did for no pay.	Neutral	8.7 ***	4.35	14.7 ****	3.99
		33.3 **********		27.1 ********	
	Agree	54.0 **************		45.9 **************	
	Disagree	2.3 *		11.8 ****	
		5.1 **		10.0 ***	
61. Share school leadership responsibilities.	Neutral	13.9 ****	4.02	22.7 *******	3.43
		45.9 **************		34.2 **********	
	Agree	32.8 **********		21.3 ******	
	Disagree	2.3 *		12.3 ****	
		4.2 *		10.8 ***	
60. Use professional skills more effectively.	Neutral	15.2 *****	4.00	25.7 ********	3.35
		47.6 **************		32.0 **********	
	Agree	30.7 *********		19.2 ******	

5. ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The policy's effectiveness as a school improvement tool is evidenced in responses to questions about school climate, curriculum and instruction, and district planning -- shown in Tables 8, 9, and 10. Principals and teachers report the CLS effective in providing a more positive climate for learning, improving student instructional programs, and carrying out both school and district curriculum planning and management tasks. Again, principal responses are generally more positive. They see the Career Ladder System as reinforcing their role as instructional leader. Teacher morale, however, is much less positively affected.

In light of principals' high rating of the system, responses to questions about the impacts of CLS on their work environment are instructive. Principals do not see their work load improved by the CLS. Case studies point to the negative effects of the greatly expanded evaluation and paperwork burdens without increased pay as one cause for this negative response. Principals are also more aware than teachers of the district level effects of the CLS. Case study data support this finding.

As these data suggest, the system has mixed effects. Nevertheless, asked for a global judgement about the CLS overall school improvements, principals and teachers alike see the CLS as positive: teachers share leadership, teacher evaluation is in place, and the overall instructional program, and individual students are benefiting. Table 11 reports these responses.

6. DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION

As Table 12 indicates, everyone agrees that districts have been fair in trying to implement the CLS. Both teachers and principals report that their districts provide the necessary information and application forms and follow fair and reasonable procedures in implementing the Career Ladder System. Nevertheless, implementation has been a major factor in the CLS's success or failure.

Districts have implemented the Career Ladder System differently. The case study data reveal that the twelve districts studied adopt one of four types of implementation strategies. The choice of implementation strategy affects the level of teacher and principal commitment to the policy.

Far West Laboratory has developed a model to describe district implementation strategies. Figure 1 depicts the four strategies.

Table 8: The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

The Career Ladder System is effective in providing...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
8. A positive climate for learning	Disagree	6.2 **	3.40	16.6 *****	3.05
		9.9 ***		15.6 *****	
	Neutral	34.2 *********		28.1 ********	
		36.9 ***********		25.7 ********	
	Agree	12.8 ****		14.0 ****	
7. A strong student instructional program	Disagree	5.8 **	3.40	16.5 *****	3.02
		12.4 ****		18.7 ******	
	Neutral	30.1 *********		25.1 ********	
		39.6 ************		26.1 ********	
	Agree	12.1 ****		13.6 ****	

The Career Ladder System has enabled me/principals to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
13. Provide stronger curricula for students.	Disagree	6.4 **	3.35	Teacher & Principal Items Differed.	
		12.8 ****			
	Neutral	33.7 *********			
		34.0 **********			
	Agree	13.1 ****			
Prepare better curriculum materials.		Teacher & Principal Items Differed.		16.6 *****	3.31
				13.3 ****	
				17.7 *****	
				27.8 ********	
				24.6 *******	
15. Coordinate school & district objectives.	Disagree	6.4 **	3.35	Teacher & Principal Items Differed.	
		16.4 *****			
	Neutral	27.2 ********			
		35.7 ***********			
	Agree	14.3 ****			
Spend time with individual students.		Teacher & Principal Items Differed.		32.9 **********	2.43
				21.7 *******	
				23.6 *******	
				13.5 ****	
				8.3 **	

Table 8: Continued....

24. Improve overall school climate.	Disagree	9.1	***		Teacher & Principal Items Differed.	
		16.3	*****			
	Neutral	28.5	*********	3.26		
		32.2	**********			
	Agree	13.9	****			
Understand how I fit into district plan.		Teacher & Principal Items Differed.			29.5	*********
					17.8	*****
					29.7	*********2.55
					14.7	****
					8.3	**

The Extended Contract effectively allows the district to...

45. Accomplish district planning & management	Disagree	4.4	*		8.3	**	
		10.5	***		10.1	***	
	Neutral	24.1	*******	3.68	34.7	**********	3.39
		34.7	**********		28.5	*********	
	Agree	26.3	********		18.4	******	

The Performance Bonus effectively helps principals to...

54. Improve instruction in the schools	Disagree	7.6	**		21.8	*******	
		10.3	***		13.3	****	
	Neutral	23.0	*******	3.55	23.0	*******	3.00
		38.2	***********		27.4	********	
	Agree	20.9	******		14.5	****	

Job Enlargement effectively allows the district to...

70. Do district curriculum planning and implementation	Disagree	2.5	*		9.8	***	
		7.6	**		11.7	****	
	Neutral	19.5	******	3.88	31.3	*********	3.34
		40.1	************		29.0	*********	
	Agree	30.3	*********		18.2	*****	

Career Ladder Levels effectively allow the district to...

88. Improve the quality of instruction in the district	Disagree	4.3	*		16.2	*****	
		14.3	****		13.5	****	
	Neutral	26.8	********	3.47	27.5	********	3.11
		39.4	************		29.0	*********	
	Agree	15.2	*****		13.8	****	

Table 9: The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

The Career Ladder System in my school has improved...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
	Disagree	5.6 **		19.3 ******	
		10.0 ***		17.3 *****	
30. The principal's role as instructional leader.	Neutral	28.8 *********	3.52	30.9 *********	2.87
		38.4 ************		22.4 *******	
	Agree	17.2 *****		10.1 ***	

Table 10: The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

The Career Ladder System is effective in providing...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
10. A positive work environment for principals.	Disagree	16.0 *****	2.86	16.8 *****	2.89
		24.8 *******		18.6 ******	
	Neutral	25.9 ********		34.7 *********	
		23.8 *******		19.1 ******	
	Agree	9.5 ***		10.8 ***	

AND

The Performance Bonus is an incentive for teachers to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
51. Observe other teachers	Disagree	9.1 ***	3.17	32.5 **********	2.47
		19.3 ******		19.3 ******	
	Neutral	30.7 *********		25.1 ********	
		27.8 ********		14.8 ****	
	Agree	13.1 ****		8.3 **	
52. Be observed by other teachers	Disagree	10.8 ***	3.14	30.8 *********	2.55
		18.8 ******		17.5 *****	
	Neutral	29.8 *********		26.4 ********	
		27.1 ********		16.4 *****	
	Agree	13.5 ****		8.9 ***	

AND

The Performance Bonus effectively allows the district to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
58. Improve the morale of teachers.	Disagree	18.2 *****	2.96	21.8 *******	3.00
		18.8 ******		13.3 ****	
	Neutral	25.2 ********		23.0 *******	
		24.7 *******		27.4 ********	
	Agree	13.1 ****		14.5 ****	

Table 11: The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

The Career Ladder System in my school has improved...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
29. Teacher leadership opportunities.	Disagree	1.9 *	3.91	13.0 ****	3.32
		7.3 **		13.6 ****	
	Neutral	14.8 ****		20.8 ******	
		49.5 ***************		34.0 **********	
	Agree	26.5 ********		18.6 ******	
33. The teacher evaluation process.	Disagree	6.3 **	3.59	17.5 *****	3.13
		11.2 ***		15.8 *****	
	Neutral	22.4 *******		20.9 ******	
		37.7 ***********		28.2 ********	
	Agree	22.4 *******		17.6 *****	
25. The overall instructional program.	Disagree	4.1 *	3.57	17.3 *****	3.03
		8.3 **		16.5 *****	
	Neutral	30.9 *********		25.0 ********	
		40.0 ************		27.9 ********	
	Agree	16.7 *****		13.3 ****	
26. Attention to student academic progress.	Disagree	3.7 *	3.51	16.6 *****	3.07
		8.9 ***		16.3 *****	
	Neutral	32.9 *********		24.4 *******	
		42.0 *************		29.2 *********	
	Agree	12.5 ****		13.5 ****	

Table 12: Principal and Teacher Views regarding whether:

My district followed fair and reasonable procedures for...

The Components.		Principal Opinion (%)		Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)		Tchr. Mean
91. The Extended Contract Days Component.	Disagree	1.0		4.50	1.6		4.38
		1.9	*		2.6	*	
	Neutral	5.6	**		11.9	****	
		29.5	*********		23.6	*******	
	Agree	62.0	***************		60.3	***************	
92. The Job Enlargement Component.	Disagree	1.0		4.24	7.9	**	3.62
		4.4	*		7.6	**	
	Neutral	10.9	***		27.8	********	
		36.7	***********		28.3	********	
	Agree	47.0	***************		28.4	*********	
94. The Career Ladder Levels Component.	Disagree	2.8	*	4.10	11.0	***	3.55
		5.5	**		10.2	***	
	Neutral	16.3	*****		21.6	******	
		29.9	*********		27.4	********	
	Agree	45.5	***************		29.8	*********	
93. The Performance Bonus Component.	Disagree	2.1	*	4.05	15.4	*****	3.35
		8.4	***		10.3	***	
	Neutral	15.7	*****		23.0	*******	
		30.4	*********		26.7	********	
	Agree	43.4	**************		24.6	*******	

My district provided application forms & information for...

The Components.		Principal Opinion (%)		Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)		Tchr. Mean
96. The Job Enlargement opportunities.	Disagree	1.3		4.49	7.0	**	3.91
		1.5			7.9	**	
	Neutral	6.5	**		16.7	*****	
		28.6	*********		24.4	*******	
	Agree	62.1	***************		44.0	**************	
97. A Performance Bonus.	Disagree	.8		4.49	5.3	**	4.01
		2.5	*		6.9	**	
	Neutral	6.8	**		15.6	*****	
		26.8	********		25.8	********	
	Agree	63.1	***************		46.4	***************	
95. Extended Contract Days.	Disagree	2.5	*	4.48	3.0	*	4.34
		1.5			3.3	*	
	Neutral	7.7	**		11.4	***	
		21.9	*******		21.6	******	
	Agree	66.4	***************		60.7	***************	
98. Advancement on the Career Ladder.	Disagree	1.0		4.44	6.2	**	4.04
		2.6	*		6.0	**	
	Neutral	9.4	***		13.7	****	
		25.5	********		26.0	********	
	Agree	61.5	***************		48.1	***************	

Figure 1: District Implementation Strategies

PROCEDURAL	MANAGERIAL
o focus on integrity of the process	o focus on individual and institutional goals
PROFORMA	**PROGRAMMATIC**
o focus on paper compliance	o focus on "right" results

Managerial/Professional Implementation

This implementation mode creates the conditions under which meaningful school improvement is most likely to occur. In districts characterized by this strategy, teachers and administrators share the view of Career Ladders as both an attractive teacher professional growth and compensation system and a valuable school improvement tool.

In these districts improved teacher performance is regarded as synonymous with improved organizational effectiveness. Teachers regard evaluation as a legitimate source of professional improvement and an acceptable criteria for professional advancement. Activities associated with the four components are not viewed as hoop-jumping in order to receive extra pay, but rather legitimate avenues to improved professional competence.

Principals in these districts recognize evaluation not merely as a ritual exercise but as integral to their role of instructional leader. They are able to use the tool to help teachers improve their practice.

Decisionmaking regarding Career Ladder plans and programs is generally inclusive and collegial, not dominated by either administrators or teachers. Shared decisionmaking reinforces the perception that the Career Ladder plan is both procedurally fair and congruent with teacher,school and district goals.

Programmatic Implementation

This implementation strategy characterizes districts that view the Career Ladder as a system for realizing district program goals at the expense of teacher professional development. The plan is viewed almost exclusively as an administrative tool. Emphasis is generally on getting the right program results with little attention to formal procedures for achieving results.

Organizational needs drive decisionmaking. It is carried out by administrators who generally determine what kinds of activities are funded and who is eligible for funding under the various components. Professional role expansion and rewards for teaching excellence are secondary concerns.

Teachers often perceive the allocation of expanded work opportunities, performance bonuses, and placement on Ladder Levels as driven by administrator bias or favoritism rather than merit. From the teachers' views this serves to disconnect the system from real professional development purposes. Teachers perceive currying favor, not improving professionally, as the driving force of the system.

Procedural Implementation

In districts characterized by procedural implementation strategies, administrators and teachers regard the Career Ladder System as a formal regulation to be implemented without a larger vision of its organizational and professional development potential. The legislation is understood primarily as a bureaucratic tool for distributing income to teachers.

Administrators and teachers in procedural districts often formally negotiate controls over the various components of the Ladders. A focus on procedural fairness and the standardization of rules determines organizational or programmatic uses of the system. A major concern of implementation is due process.

Teachers in these districts often complain of the 'hoop-jumping' required by the Career Ladder plans because expanded work responsibilities and compensation for teaching excellence are awarded according to fair rules -- but not in relation to a coherent school or district plan aimed at substantive improvement in the teacher performance or program.

Proforma Implementation

In proforma districts, local interests and needs supplant state goals for the Career Ladder System, leaving the district minimally compliant with the intent of the legislation. Several reasons could explain why this type of implementation occurs. Extenuating circumstances -- rapid growth without concurrent increase in funding supports, lack of technical expertise needed to implement so complex a policy, lack of trust of state intrusion into local district affairs, or lack of trust that existing collegial relationships within the district can be sustained through implementation -- lead districts to proforma implementation.

Teachers and principals often are not aware of the options offered by the system or have very different views of how the various components are implemented either in the school or throughout the district. However, because substantial amounts of money are associated with the various components, this lack of shared understanding serves to lower teacher trust of administrators who are perceived as controlling monetary allocations.

In some schools, relationships among teachers suffer as overall lack of understanding about procedures and general purposes of the policy fosters distrust and suspicion of others who seem to benefit from various components.

Proforma implementation generally results in severe criticism of the program by both teachers and principals who are unclear about its purposes, uncertain about the rules which govern implementation, and feel the negative effects in their schools.

The 12 districts studied can be placed in one of four different strategies according to their current approach to implementation:

Managerial/Professional	2
Programmatic	4
Procedural	2
Proforma	4

The present placement of districts is not permanent. Case study data indicate that districts have moved over time from proforma to both programmatic and procedural implementation strategies. Movement occurs as districts learn more about how to tailor the components to their particular district needs and goals. There is evidence that this learning -- and improved implementation -- will continue over time.

CAREER LADDER POLICY OPTIONS

As the foregoing sections of this report have demonstrated, the Utah Career Ladder System has brought major changes to the public schools of this state. While the impact on the lives and work behavior of individual teachers is easily recognized, the basic changes in school organization and operations that the CLS produced also deserve attention. In this section we turn from data analysis aimed at assessing the impact of existing policy to examination of the policy options available to the Legislature and State Board of Education as they contemplate ways of refining and redirecting the Career Ladder System. Our discussion of policy options is divided into three parts. First, we offer a conceptual model for distinguishing among the key components of the overall CLS and indicate how that model can guide policy deliberations. Second, we consider ways in which the Far West Laboratory evaluation study focuses attention on five basic issues that define the alternatives for refining and expanding the system. Finally, we summarize recommended changes aimed at improving the overall performance of the Career Ladder System during the next five to ten years.

The Conceptual Model: CLS as a Policy Intervention

The individual components of the CLS represent a coordinated effort by Utah policymakers to alter the behavior of individual educators and to bring about overall school improvement. To understand how the elements of this policy might be changed to better reach these basic goals, we need to understand how they work together, tackling similar problems from different perspectives and with different effects.

Figure 2 provides an organized way of thinking about how the four basic CLS components attack the issue of school improvement. The figure distinguishes among the CLS components along two dimensions. First, they are separated (across the vertical axis) according to the target of the policy intervention. Two of the components are addressed primarily to improving the performance of individual educators, the other two toward enhancing the effectiveness of the overall school organization.

The components are also separated according to their primary goal or policy objective (across the horizontal axis of the figure). Two of the CLS components -- Extended Contract Day and Job Enlargement -- seek to expand the scope and amount of work done in the schools. The other two components -- Performance Bonuses and Career Ladder Levels -- aim primarily at enhancing the quality and effectiveness of the work.

Figure 2: The Career Ladder System by Components

Individual Change	Organizational Change
Performance Bonus (better work)	Career Ladder Levels (more and better)
Extended Contract Year (more work)	Job Enlargement (more work)

As suggested by the vertical axis in the figure, the Extended Contract Year and Performance Bonus payments improve schools by trying to improve the work of individual teachers. These components have the virtues of simplicity and directness. Although they are often resisted for both good and bad motives, they are easily understood and can be quickly implemented.

The virtues of extending contracts and awarding bonuses are also their greatest limitations, however. They do not alter underlying organizational processes in the school. They tend to concentrate attention on the personal ability or level of dedication of *individual* teachers, ignoring the impact of organizational planning, resource allocation and administrative authority on school effectiveness.

The organizational impact of the Job Enlargement and Career Ladder Levels components are equally obvious. Schools cannot continue to do "business as usual" if they are to effectively incorporate these components into their school operation. If Career Ladder Levels are to become anything more than a renamed salary schedule, long established traditions of teacher promotion and compensation have to be changed. Similarly, Job Enlargement activities become meaningful only if schools and districts begin to incorporate them into long range planning and program development.

As suggested by the horizontal axis in Figure 2, the four basic CLS components cluster differently when viewed from the perspective of their primary objectives. Two of the components -- Performance Bonuses and Career Ladder Levels -- aim at linking teacher income to a system of evaluation in order to improve the *quality* of their work. The other two components -- the Extended Contract Year and Job Enlargement -- are only loosely linked to evaluation. Their primary objective is expanding the *quantity* of work done in the school; enabling schools and districts to purchase teacher time to perform services that might otherwise not be available.

The Extended Contract Year and Job Enlargement Components share in common the objective of expanding the scope of work done in the schools. These two components provide schools with the resources to buy more teacher time. As indicated above, they differ in the reasons for using resources in this way. The Extended Contract Year Component supports expansion of the work done by individual teachers, with relatively little attention given to whether that work has value to the overall school organization. The Job Enlargement Component, by contrast, provides resources to purchase additional teacher time to be used in ways that directly serve the organizational needs of the school or district.

As the top row of Figure 2 shows, the Performance Bonus and Career Ladder Levels Components of the CLS share the common objective of improving the quality of work done in the schools. Here again, however, they target this objective for quite different reasons. The Performance Bonus Component was originally designed to focus direct attention on the quality of individual teacher performance. And it has been modified several times in the last four years through both legislative and State Board of Education policy to reinforce this policy objective.

The Career Ladder Levels have a more organizational target in mind, however. They want to ensure high quality teacher performance, to be sure, but the targeted objective is restructuring the status system of the school to insure that senior teachers would be those recognized to have performed well over a period of years. That is, while Performance Bonuses aim at improving individual teacher work quality, the Career Ladder Levels aim at improving the quality of the entire work force.

Five Alternatives for Refining and Expanding the System

1. Managing Teacher Performance
2. Continuing Support for Teacher Evaluation
3. Controlling Salary Effects
4. Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness
5. Supporting District Implementation

1. MANAGING TEACHER PERFORMANCE: BUYING MORE -- AND MORE EFFECTIVE -- TEACHER TIME

The single most important aim of the CLS is to improve schools by enhancing teacher job performance. While this overriding goal is obvious, the four core components of the system make very different contributions to its realization.

The Performance Bonus Component may seem to be ideally suited to improving teacher performance by insisting that it be evaluated and directly rewarded. In a number of ways, however, the data discussed earlier in this report suggest that this is not the only way to improve performance, and in many situations may not be the most effective.

If, for example, teacher effectiveness is limited by inadequate curriculum materials or a lack of staff training in how to use those that are available, state investment in Job Enlargement or the Extended Contract Year may have greater overall impact. Curriculum development is not something individual teachers can do on their own initiative. It must be tackled as an organizational problem -- a process that is facilitated by encouraging teachers to work outside their regular teaching hours in collaboration with colleagues.

The evidence gathered in this study strongly supports the conclusion that Job Enlargement and Extended Contract Year funds have had a substantial and widely recognized positive impact on school district curriculum development and instructional preparation. In apportioning funds and promulgating implementation regulations, policymakers should give careful consideration to the question of what factors are creating the greatest stumbling blocks for teachers.

Where performance is limited by teacher ability or dedication, a system of Performance Bonuses may well serve as a critical motivational tool. Even where this is true, emphasis on the Career Ladder Levels may serve as a more effective stimulus to high performance. If the limitations faced by individual teachers are ones that take extensive training to overcome, the slower cycle and more permanent rewards attached to advancement up the Career Ladder will match the reward system to the behavior needed for substantial performance improvement.

Where the factors limiting teacher performance are not under their direct control -- either because the school is failing to provide needed teaching resources or because the teachers lack the training or the time to prepare adequately for their work -- the more promising policy strategy is to fund Job Enlargement or Extended Contract Year activities. These components of the CLS expand the kinds of work being done in the school and increase the likelihood that teachers will get the support services and the time needed for adequate preparation.

To oversimplify, Job Enlargement and the Extended Contract Year buy more teacher time, the Performance Bonus buys more effective utilization of the existing time and material resources. The Career Ladder Levels Component has the best chance of combining more and better quality teaching efforts. By identifying as the most highly valued members of the faculty those who consistently perform well and engage in a broad range school program activities, the Career Ladder Levels can be used to help build a local school culture dedicated to excellence.

2. CONTINUING SUPPORT FOR TEACHER EVALUATION: ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE BONUSES

The extent to which the Utah CLS has succeeded in focusing the attention of local educators on the evaluation of teachers should be taken as one of its most important achievements. However, the use of teacher evaluation systems is controversial. Only about 15 percent of the principals and teachers surveyed cited evaluation of job performance as one of the two most important factors in determining placement of teachers on a particular Career Ladder level. More importantly, anxiety about the reliability and fairness of current evaluation systems are widely evidenced in the twelve case study districts.

Where bonuses are being sought by teachers and distributed by school districts on the basis of a shared belief in the accuracy and fairness of a particular evaluation process, the effect will almost certainly guarantee that teachers will try their very best to produce the teaching behaviors desired and rewarded. The field data suggest that this is not the typical case, however. There is substantial concern that the evaluation process involves a lot of "hoop-jumping." This leads to dissension and sometimes to dissembling behavior.

Moreover, precise guidelines for teacher evaluation do not guarantee legitimacy of the outcome. Teachers and principals do not necessarily believe that conducting two evaluations per year ensures that teachers do better teaching. Establishing strict guidelines about how and who conducts evaluations can only ensure that the act takes place. Allowing administrators and principals to work through a careful process to develop evaluation instruments and receive training contributes to the perceived legitimacy of evaluation. A deliberate process acts as an incentive for teachers to receive high ratings on evaluations.

The tensions between the precision and legitimacy in evaluation suggest an interim strategy while learning about how evaluation best takes place. Retaining the Performance Bonus component at a symbolic level -- limiting the monetary awards to a range of $200-$500, for example -- can foster an "academy award" effect while serving notice that excellence is expected in the district; mediocrity is not. At the same time, learning about how to conduct teacher evaluation continues, along with growing trust in the process and the likelihood that it will, in fact, result in improved teaching practice.

When bonuses are used to encourage standards of good teaching they buy quality. When used to select out a few they buy dissension, creating a system of competition and resentment.

After the evaluation process stabilizes in schools, presumably in two to three years, the Performance Bonus might be folded into the Career Ladder Levels Component. Senate Bill 100, which mandates yearly evaluation of teachers, supplants the Performance Bonus benefits. Yearly evaluation will occur whether or not bonuses or advancement on the Career Ladder follows. Routine evaluation for advancement -- a feature of the Career Ladder -- would seem to serve the same purpose. Funds directed to Ladders from the Performance Bonus could increase teacher incentives for movement up the ladder.

3. CONTROLLING SALARY EFFECTS: THE BENEFITS OF BALANCE

A major finding from the Far West Laboratory evaluation study was the extraordinary reallocation of teacher salaries resulting from implementation of the Career Ladder System. With about 10 percent of their annual salary separating the teachers getting the smallest CLS payments from those receiving the largest payments, there is no reason to expect larger salary differentials to have a greater impact on either the quality or the quantity of teacher work.

Whether the CLS salary differentials are targeted to those teachers whose work is of greatest value to overall school effectiveness is a more complex question. There are two dimensions to this question. First, how can state policymakers be confident that the money intended as a reward for high quality work is going to those who do, in fact, perform their duties with the greatest skill and dedication?

As we have already indicated, the current state of teacher evaluation technology suggests that there will almost certainly be at least some slippage between objective teacher excellence and the results of any teacher evaluation process. For policymakers the lesson is clear: keep rewards based on teacher performance evaluation small enough that they can be viewed more as symbols of recognition than as basic income by the teachers who receive them. Teachers are very sensitive to symbolic recognition for their work. There is no reason to believe that putting large amounts of money into performance evaluation based payment systems improves performance as much as it will create dissention and reduce morale.

A second dimension to the salary targeting issue is whether the money is being paid to those teachers whose work is quantitatively superior. Is the salary money going to those who are doing the most work or the work which is of the most value to the schools?

While the Performance Bonus Component is explicitly focused on the qualitative dimensions of teacher work performance, each of the other CLS components has the capacity to address quantitative issues more directly. The choice between the other three components is a matter of deciding who is likely to be the best judge of the most valuable tasks to be performed.

The Extended Contract Year Component places primary emphasis on teacher judgement (though our study suggested that the most effective use of this component occurs in those districts where district administrators share with teachers in the responsibility for deciding how best to spend the days). Job Enlargement contrasts most sharply with the Extended Contract Year Component in its assignment of authority for identifying the most valuable tasks to school administrators.

The Career Ladder Levels is the most complex of the CLS components when it comes to this issue. In those districts where movement up the Ladder is explicitly linked to expansion of teacher job responsibilities, the decision about what tasks are of value involves a broad cross-section of both teachers and administrators. Salary money put into the Career Ladder Levels, if districts can rise above proforma implementation of the policy, has the greatest chance of being focused on the most crucial educational tasks.

As districts are working to develop effective Career Ladder systems, it is probably critical that the legislature continue to divide the salary budget, giving individual teachers enough to support their individual needs, targeting some to district priorities through Job Enlargement, and providing enough to the Career Ladder Levels to make local efforts to plan and implement this complex component economically worthwhile.

4. ENHANCING ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: WORKLOAD CHANGES AND WORK PLACE BENEFITS

Although no school can perform effectively without high performance from individual teachers and administrators, there is good reason to believe that professional competence is not enough. For nearly three decades, the best research has supported the public view that effective schools differ in organizational character and climate as well as in the competence and performance of individual staff members. Consequently, the impact of the CLS on the character and operation of Utah school organizations was a matter of special interest to the Far West Laboratory research team.

From a policy perspective, the issue of organizational effectiveness is a straightforward matter: Has the work required to develop local CLS plans and implement their complex provisions been adequately rewarded by improved school productivity? While this question is simple enough to pose; it is extraordinarily difficult to answer clearly.

The available evidence leaves no doubt that development and implementation of local Career Ladder Systems have required enormous effort and dedication in most school districts. It is important to distinguish between the work required to improve school operations, however, from that required to manage and document the CLS itself. There is nothing wrong with creating additional work responsibilities for the schools, if the work is adequately compensated and it leads to better educational outcomes. If the administrative and compliance burdens created by the system distract from educational program and services, or if they require extraordinary effort from people who are not adequately compensated for that effort, then the policy should be abandoned.

There are three dimensions to the work load that have been created by the CLS that should be monitored and used as criteria for reinforcing or modifying the overall system. Two are costly and reflect ways in which the CLS may interfere with school performance. These are:

- the workload placed on the teachers who must document their performance to qualify for increased payments,
- the workload placed on principals and other administrators who must evaluate the teachers,
- the workload placed on districts to decide the use of additional time purchased with CLS funds.

Each of these workload considerations has clear policy implications.

The workload placed on teachers in the preparation of documentary evidence used to judge their performance is an obvious cost in the CLS implementation equation. This burden varies substantially from district to district, and it is especially heavy in relation to the Performance Bonus and Career Ladder Levels Components.

If, on the average, teachers will receive approximately $200 in Performance Bonus money, it makes no sense for them to spend long hours preparing evidence to support their application for bonus payments -- unless that work is clearly linked to their own personal or professional development. This conclusion is not altered by the fact that those teachers who actually qualify for bonus payments typically receive between $600 and $700. The work load on the school system is shared by those who fail to qualify as well as by those who succeed. From a policy perspective, it is important to keep workloads reasonably linked to compensation.

In the case of the Career Ladder Levels compensation, the increased workload placed on teachers can be amortized over several years, since placement on a higher level means continued increase in pay. Moreover, the average Career Ladder Level payment is more than twice as large as the average Performance Bonus (those who actually qualify for higher level placement average nearly $1,000 in increased income). Thus, policy could appropriately place a substantially larger documentation burden on those seeking Career Ladder Level advancement.

Teachers and principals alike agree that the workload burden for principals is a source of serious inequity in the current CLS. While most agree that increased attention by principals to matters of teacher evaluation and teacher supervision are having positive benefits to the schools, most educators are painfully aware that principals must carry this burden without either extra compensation or explicit relief from other duties. The result is a reorganization of the principal's work role. Less attention is being paid to support service management and parent or community relations than was formerly the case. We found no clear evidence that this redefinition of the principal's work role has negative impact on the schools, but we note that it is far larger in magnitude than anyone had anticipated. It needs to be more carefully analyzed than our present data will permit.

Increased principal workloads are not uniformly generated by each of the CLS components. The Performance Bonus Component generates the largest increase, followed generally by the principal's role in monitoring and accounting for teacher use of Extended Contract Year. The Job Enlargement Component usually puts teacher work efforts at the disposal of administrators, in some cases offsetting the increased burdens resulting from the other components. The policy message is a simple one: streamline and simplify CLS administration wherever possible in order to reduce principal overburdens.

The third workload consideration to be considered by policymakers is probably the most important -- is the work being bought and paid for by the CLS adequately directed toward increased school productivity? Evidence from the Far West Laboratory evaluation study supports a generally affirmative answer to this question.

To a remarkable extent, educators throughout the state affirmed that critical tasks are being performed as a result of the CLS -- much more than would have been otherwise done. The Job Enlargement Component has stimulated very substantial new curriculum developments. The Extended Contract Year Component has encouraged teachers to perform duties they have always recognized as important, but have not always been willing to do without compensation and direction.

Over the long run, school effectiveness is best supported by emphasizing the Career Ladder Levels and the Extended Contract Year Components of the CLS. The Career Ladder Levels Component encourages expanded teacher professionalism and appropriately links job definition to acceptance of responsibility for school climate and effectiveness. The Extended Contract Year Component allows professionally responsible teachers to be compensated for performance of vital preparation and instructional support activities.

Organizational effectiveness is more than a matter of workload. Effective organizations require coordination and cooperation among all key staff members, not just appropriate work efforts from each. Perhaps the greatest risk to school effectiveness to be found in the CLS is its tendency to encourage the perception that the self-interest of teachers is at odds with the overall interest of the school. Where teachers come to see interests as divergent and competitive rather than shared and collaborative, there is a strong tendency for energy to be absorbed in destructive conflict.

Existing Career Ladder Systems tend to encourage competition in two ways. First, as the literature on competitive payment systems in the private sector make abundantly clear, whenever differential compensation systems are developed employees are faced with a dilemma. They can assume that the evaluation of their work will be fair and that their best chances for increased compensation is to work hard and meet quality standards, or they can assume that the evaluation system is inherently unfair and they can increase their own compensation only by reducing the amount paid to others. Whenever a staff member comes to believe the latter assumption, their behavior becomes extraordinarily destructive, both to their own job performance and to the overall effectiveness of the organization. Each of the four components of the CLS, if not properly implemented, can encourage the negative work pattern associated with the second assumption.

The dangers from a competitive Performance Bonus system are obvious. Less obvious are those arising in connection with Job Enlargement opportunities that may be seen as linked to favoritism among administrators, Career Ladder Levels systems that are cynically evaluated as "hoop-jumping" required to secure previously automatic increases in pay, or even the Extended Contract Year Component if some teachers begin to see others compensated for compliance with procedures but without engaging in substantive work.

On balance, the risks of negative competition appear to be relatively small under the current Career Ladder System, with the exception of the Performance Bonus Component. Nine of the 12 case study districts took steps to avoid direct implementation of the Performance Bonus Component as originally intended by the legislature. It would not be fair to conclude that these districts sought to avoid identifying or rewarding high quality teaching, or that they lacked the desire to utilize the CLS to improve school performance. To the contrary, these districts include all of the most fully developed CLS programs, where great effort was put into capitalizing on the organizational improvement opportunities inherent in the CLS. We conclude that the bad experience of some districts which tried to implement Performance Bonus systems that were not recognized as legitimate by teachers, led many districts to find creative ways of reducing the risks of destroying teacher morale and cooperation.

The policy message embedded in this experience is complicated, but important. For a variety of reasons, local district leaders are generally in a good position to judge whether implementation of a particular policy will stimulate strong negative reactions from key staff members or local constituency groups. State policymakers may choose to keep the pressure on these local education leaders to comply with the legislative intent of competitively rewarding high performing teachers. If they do, however, it is important that technical support and appropriate amounts of time be provided for compliance with policies that carry such powerful destructive potential.

5. SUPPORTING DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION: ISSUES FOR THE NEXT PHASE

In examining district efforts to implement the CLS we were impressed with the energy and thoughtfulness with which most local leaders approached their responsibilities. Even in the midst of uncertainty and disagreement, most local educators have tried to turn the CLS into an opportunity to enhance the lives of teachers and the performance of schools. As we talked with the most sensitive and dedicated leaders in our twelve case study districts, we came to recognize a pervasive dilemma for policymakers. We found that there is a substantive tension between regulatory compliance and the mobilization of teacher energy and dedication. The more the CLS is perceived to be a state mandated program accompanied by high-powered regulations, the less it is seen as an opportunity for local educators to respond to their own concepts of teacher professionalism and school improvement. Grudging, proforma compliance is relatively easy for state officials to secure. But compliance at this level produces the form of a CLS without any substantive improvement in the schools. As local leaders use the CLS creatively to respond to local conditions and to pursue their own ideas about how best to enhance school performance, it is easy for them to misinterpret or simply ignore the state's goals.

To realize the full intentions of the legislature -- that is, to pursue school improvement through differential compensation and work role expansion for teachers -- requires that district level educators both understand and adopt as their own the legislature's goals. To achieve this result, regulations need to be clear, unambiguous, consistently applied, and stable over an extended period of time. Moreover, the local leaders must believe that the program reflects a long term and serious policy commitment by state leaders.

Additionally, any policy as complex and difficult to administer as the CLS needs to have a relatively permanent, substantial and secure funding base. Until state level commitment to the CLS becomes a permanent, settled and routine part of Utah education policy, there will always be places where compliance is weak or non-existent.

Stability and adequate funding is not all that is needed to help districts with their implementation efforts, however. Local districts have had to invent a wide variety of enormously complicated procedures for implementation. They have had to develop acceptable teacher evaluation systems, to differentiate and define teacher work responsibilities at various levels, to cope with the negative fallout of denying individual teachers income producing opportunities for advancement or job enlargement, to plan and supervise expanded teacher work efforts, to build a new accounting system to monitor Career Ladder expenditures, and a host of other new activities.

In responding to these challenging administrative responsibilities, districts have borrowed heavily from one another. This borrowing has not always been well informed. The borrowing process helps districts avoid the most disastrous of mistakes, but the state could play a major role in helping to insure that the borrowing represents a borrowing of the best rather than the most popular procedures and program elements.

Local educators need a strong program of systematic study of various approaches to job enlargement, teacher evaluation, compensation determination and other critical ingredients of a successful CLS. While it is important for state officials to monitor district compliance with statutes and State Board regulations, it is probably even more important that ways be further developed to identify and support inter-district borrowing of the most effective local implementation systems and policies.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A multi-year commitment to the Career Ladder System would make it clear to the districts that the policy cannot be ignored. A proforma response to implementation on the part of some districts continues because they believe the policy is temporary.

2. Continued State Department of Education technical assistance to districts in implementing the Career Ladder System would stabilize the policy. The state needs to continue its central role in assisting districts in implementation, problem solving and the dissemination of excellent district practices.

3. Compensating teachers under the Extended Contract Year at their established step and lane salary rate reinforces the professional role of the teacher. Because non-instructional time lays the foundation for improved direct instruction, it should be compensated at the same rate as direct instructional time.

4. Expanding the Extended Contract Year will provide teachers with more opportunities to improve individual delivery of curriculum.

5. If the state requires a minimum of two days prior to the opening of schools and three days distributed throughout the school year for individual teacher planning, it would ensure that crucial instructional support time for teachers is not completely supplanted by school or district needs.

6. If the state would like to encourage the "venture capital" aspect of Job Enlargement, it should require that the positions be short term. This component should not be used to fund permanent positions in the district, nor should teachers be encouraged to view the extra compensation as a permanent salary supplement. The activities compensated under this component should encourage schools to be flexible and innovative.

7. Under the best of circumstances, the Job Enlargement Component would be a temporary feature of the Career Ladder System. During this first phase of Career Ladders, it has enabled schools to learn what additional teacher work is essential to the smooth running of the organization. In districts where the Job Enlargement Component is working the best, it has functioned to move the schools towards a more highly differentiated system where different levels on the Career Ladder are associated with different responsibilities.

8. During the next phase of the policy, the work performed under Job Enlargement would be institutionalized either into the professional responsibilities of senior teachers at the highest Career Ladder Levels or as full-time positions within the school. Short term, special projects would then be folded into the Extended Contract Year Component. A possible time frame to achieve this might be to stabilize for the next three years and then require districts to fold Job Enlargement into the ladder levels component during years four and five.

9. If the state would like to continue to encourage individual teachers to improve the quality of their teaching performance and at the same time continue to encourage the shared leadership necessary to the effective operation of the school, it should keep the funding allocated to the Performance Bonus Component relatively small. The present 10 percent Career Ladder seems an appropriate emphasis.

10. The Performance Bonus should function as a symbolic reward for teaching excellence, but it should not be limited to an elite few. Rewarding a few teachers creates a system of competition and resentment, not collegiality. When the Performance Bonus is used to encourage standards of good teaching, it buys quality. When it is used to reward only a few, it buys dissension.

11. While districts are still learning how to differentiate professional responsibilities, it is important to allow district discretion in determining the funding for the ladder levels. The Career Ladder Levels Component has the fundamental capacity to transform the Utah public schools. If the state would increase the level of technical assistance to the districts to help them further develop a ladder system which incorporates both Performance Bonus and Job Enlargement activities, it would be successful. By the end of Phase II, districts should have fully funded ladder levels; possible by directing funds formerly used for Performance Bonuses and Job Enlargement to the Ladder Levels and Extended Contract Year Components.

12. The state should continue its support for teacher evaluation. Demonstrated teaching excellence must be a requirement for advancement in the teaching profession if the concept of senior teacher is to have legitimacy within the system. The requirement of periodic teacher evaluations and high ratings as necessary to advancement on or retention of ladder levels is important. Periodic evaluations, yearly for lower level assignments and every other year at the highest ladder levels, would communicate that sustained teaching excellence is required to retain professional status.

APPENDIX A

Superintendent and Board President Telephone Survey Data

TELEPHONE SURVEY

Background

During July and August, 1987, the 40 superintendents and the 40 board presidents of the Utah public schools were sent a letter asking them to participate in a telephone survey concerned with the Career Ladder System. The letter stated that the survey would focus on the components of the policy and their effect on the work of teachers, principals, and district administrators. A follow-up telephone call set an appointment for a conversation of approximately one half hour in length.

Far West Laboratory had complete interviews with 38 of the 40 superintendents and 36 of the schools board presidents. Two of the superintendents were new to their districts and were not able to discuss the CLS in any detail. Two of the board presidents were not interviewed because of schedule conflicts and two were new to their positions and not yet familiar with the different components.

The telephone survey is composed of 11 questions. (see Appendix D). The first two questions focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the CLS. Questions three through seven focus on the five different components: The Extended Contract Year, Performance Bonus, Job Enlargement, Career Ladder Levels, and Incentive Funding for Teacher Shortages. During the interview, superintendents and board presidents were asked to discuss the ways the different components have modified both how teachers teach,and how principals and other administrators do their work in the district. Questions eight through ten focus on implementation -- the process by which teachers, principals and community groups like the PTA have come to understand the CLS. Question eleven asks the superintendents and board presidents to describe what they would say to the Utah State Legislature about their experiences with the Career Ladder System in their districts if they were given a few minutes for testimony.

Survey Findings

There were patterns to the interview responses. First, the general level of support for the program was very high. Ninety-five percent of the superintendents and 90 percent of the board presidents supported the continued funding of the Career Ladder System. The superintendents who did not support the program mainly expressed problems with implementation of the Performance Bonus and the Career Ladder Levels component. They reported teacher divisiveness and conflicts between teachers and principals concerning both the evaluation process and the bonus system. The superintendents concluded that they would be more supportive of the program if regulatory adjustments are made in one or more of the components.

Ninety percent of school board presidents agreed that the CLS should be continued. Those who did not support the concept generally held back for two reasons: they were concerned about implementation difficulties or about trade-offs between funding for Career Ladders and for Weighted Pupil Units. One board president's comment typifies the latter concerns:

> It's hard to totally support ladders when we're so desperate for money for the whole system. I support money for teachers -- I just wish there were more for the rest of the system costs.

Both superintendents and board presidents agreed in the ranking of the four major components of the CLS in terms of teacher and principal level of support in their districts. The order of the ranking is:

1. Extended Contract Year
2. Job Enlargement
3. Career Ladder Levels
4. Performance Bonus

Superintendents and board presidents reported strong general support from teachers and principals for the Extended Contract Year. There was strong agreement among them that this component contributes to the smoother running of the schools. Job Enlargement was viewed as contributing to the overall ability of the schools to provide curriculum enrichment and additional activities for students than the schools were able to do before. Career Ladder Levels was the least understood of the four components. Many superintendents and board presidents stated that it was the component they had the most difficulty in designing with satisfaction in their plans. As one superintendent said:

> Our ladder is really our salary scale. Teachers are placed by both years of experience and level of education. Our teachers would feel very alarmed if that changed for them. They all have heard of other districts which have thrown these criteria out the window and it has been a disaster.

In general, many board presidents were not well informed about how the different components actually work in their districts. They were familiar with the Career Ladder System in general, but were not able to discuss in detail the different components or make distinctions among them in terms of specific approaches to implementation. If the board presidents also served on the district Career Ladder Committee, they were generally more informed. If not, they could discuss the CLS in broad terms from board meetings or from discussions with teachers who were involved in the program.

In only one district did the views of the board president differ strongly from the views of the superintendent. Generally, board presidents and superintendents described both the strengths and weaknesses of the CLS in similar ways. Though, as stated before, the superintendents were much more fully informed of the teacher and principal experiences with the components in their districts.

Most Valuable about the Career Ladder System

The two most frequent responses to the question of what has been most valuable about the CLS were:

- it has made evaluation a major focus
- it has provided teachers with more money

One superintendent said:

> We have tied the program to teacher performance and evaluation. The result has been that teacher performance is better now, of a higher quality. We are focused on what teachers actually do in the classroom more than we were before. Not just the administrators, but the teachers too. You visit the schools and everyone is talking about how you evaluate teaching, who should do it, and how it can be done right.

Both superintendents and board presidents felt that the additional money the program provided teachers was important. Though it is interesting to note that when asked if an across the board salary raise for teachers would be as valuable, only two superintendent said yes. The rest of the respondents said they thought the design of CLS policy contributed more to school improvement than a flat salary increase would. One board president said:

> I think our teachers were underpaid. Career Ladders has given them some of the additional funds they deserve. Now they can get paid for more work within their profession. This means they don't have to go out after school to a second job every afternoon in order to support their families.

Superintendents reported that the CLS provided their districts with the money and a system for doing things that was not available before. More curriculum development and support for teacher leaders were the two most commonly mentioned examples. Superintendents described school enrichment through the addition of new courses, summer school programs and after school tutorials that were only sporadically provided before. As one superintendent said:

> We're doing things for students we simply could not have done before. And teachers are getting the chance get involved with the schools like they weren't able to do before. This program is really changing things.

Most Problematic about the Career Ladder System

The two most frequent responses to what has been most difficult or problematic about the Career Ladder System were:

- difficulties with the implementation of the performance bonus component
- the paperwork involved in the development of the plans and the implementation of the policy

Superintendents described the difficulty in developing a performance bonus plan which would reward good teachers and at the same time not create severe morale problems or destroy the working relationship between the principals and the teachers. One superintendent said:

> Clearly the Performance Bonus component has been the least satisfying for everybody in the system. We ducked it last year because when funds were cut, we gave it up. We're just getting started now and I hope the evaluation system in place works for us.

Many superintendents discussed their concerns with the evaluation process. Many acknowledged concern about attaching money to the evaluation process. As one superintendent said:

> Evaluation is not an exact science. It is still somewhat subjective, no matter what instrument you choose. You can't say a teacher is exactly one specific place on a scale. It then gets even more difficult when you have to make a decision with a stipend attached to it. We have many excellent

> teachers in my district and I like the idea of rewarding merit. But the evaluation process is a complicated one and even a good instrument is not the complete answer.

The paperwork involved in implementing such a complex program was described by many superintendents as a difficult aspect of the CLS. Many superintendents described as "burdensome" the administrative time required to develop the plan, explain it to principals and teachers, present it to the community and develop the accounting system for the payment of teachers. As one superintendent said:

> I'm a big supporter of Career Ladders, but it has been a lot of work. There has been a tremendous amount of committee work and many meetings to get this started. We also keep on making changes to respond to the feedback from our teachers. The first year our evaluation system was a disaster, so we changed it. It wasn't much better the second year, but it keeps on improving. That takes time. Who has been really burdened has been the principals. Their workload has increased about 20 percent. In fact, I think there should be a separate Career Ladder System for them.

The concern with the changing role of the principal was echoed in many of the interviews with both superintendents and board presidents. The concern centered on the increased frequency with which principals are required to do evaluations and the increased number of meetings principals have both with teachers and with district administrators. As one board president said:

> I'd like to see our principals get something too. They support the program and think it has improved teacher morale, but they have to do a lot more work for no extra pay.

The Extended Contract Year

There was almost unanimous support for this component. Superintendents viewed it as contributing to the increased professionalism of teachers and to the increased effectiveness of the operations of the schools. As one superintendent said:

> It has had a positive effect on teacher morale and professionalism. It has improved instruction because it allows teachers the

> chance to really prepare. Before they would spend the weekend correcting exams and grading, then come in on Monday exhausted. Now they have time built into their schedules to do that. There is time to prepare units, prepare for team teaching and get the classrooms ready.

Concern was expressed by four board presidents who said the idea was a good one, but it needed to be more clearly communicated to parents. They reported hearing complaints from several parents who wanted to know why their children were home if the schools were open and the teachers were there. Though board members concluded it was a public relations issue, not a problem inherent to the Extended Year component.

The majority of superintendents and board presidents viewed this component as making the work of the principal easier. Almost all the superintendents interviewed believed the extra days at the beginning and the end of the year assured principals that clerical tasks associated with teaching would get done on time. Superintendents also saw this component as providing principals with some additional time to do both school-level planning with their staff and in-service activities. As one superintendent said:

> My principals are on duty anyway before school opens in the fall. But they used to have to rely on teacher volunteers. Now they can count on almost everybody showing up. It's improved the feeling in the school. Now the principals know they can be prepared for that first day of classes.

Job Enlargement

The telephone survey responses indicate that superintendents and board presidents are strongly supportive of this component. When asked how the component works in their districts, the majority of superintendents responded by stating that Job Enlargement provides districts with the enrichment activities they could not previously provide to the schools because of funding constraints. The activities most frequently mentioned by superintendents for funding under this component were: teacher leaders, mentors, curriculum development, tutoring, after school instruction in specialized areas and summer school programs. One very strong superintendent supporter of this component in his district said:

> This component has done the most for students in my district. AP and ACT scores have increased dramatically because we can

> now supplement the curriculum for our students in ways we could never do before. I definitely believe the boost in scores is because of Job Enlargement.

Job Enlargement has been viewed by the survey respondents as modifying how teachers do their work by providing them with opportunities to do additional work for extra pay. The survey responses indicate that the majority of superintendents and board presidents view this component as enriching the life of the school and the professional life of their teachers. One board president said:

> I have one friend who is a teacher in another district. He is a science teacher but is also a computer nut. Now he can run computer workshops after school and get paid for it. It is marvelous both for the students and for him. Our teachers are pretty talented people and Job Enlargement lets them use their talents in other ways besides in the classroom.

Approximately one half of the superintendents believed this component has created more work for principals in their districts. "It has added to their work" was a frequent response to the workload question. According to the surveys the workload of principals has increased both in the administration of the Job Enlargement component and in the evaluation of Job Enlargement projects. Principals also attend more meetings in association with this component. Many superintendents pointed out, however, that their principals are strongly supportive of this component because it allows them to redefine their work and their relationships to the teachers in their school. Several superintendents described the concept of shared leadership in conjunction with this component. They viewed their principals as being able to develop closer working relationships with their staff through the planning and implementation of projects funded under Job Enlargement. One superintendent said:

> The principal is no longer isolated in the school. He can now be a leader of an instructional team. He now has the time to really work with teachers, so he is not alone in the leadership role. This has been a major change in how principals do their work.

The Performance Bonus Component

From the perspective of the superintendents, the Performance Bonus component has been the most controversial of the components to implement in their districts. As two superintendents said humorously when asked how the component works in their district--"...with difficulty."

Superintendents expressed concern both with limiting the number of rewards available to good teachers and reliability of the evaluation procedure required to award the bonuses. They were not troubled with the concept of rewarding good teaching; in fact, almost all superintendents and board presidents were supportive of the idea. Several superintendents stated that the Performance Bonus component forces teachers to confront data from principals, other teachers, and parents concerning their teaching performance. "Teachers are now more self-reflective..." was a phrase repeated by superintendents. But in general, many superintendents described a reward system which gave bonuses to the majority of teachers who applied. As several superintendents said, " The majority of our teachers are excellent and they deserve the bonus."

Board presidents were generally less knowledgeable of the Performance Bonus component. They knew it was the component of the CLS which encouraged and rewarded excellent teachers. They were very supportive of rewarding teachers who do a good job in the classroom. In districts where implementation of the component created problems, board presidents were aware of the teacher dissension. Most of them concluded that the district needed more time to implement Performance Bonuses or the district needed to find a more fair evaluation instrument. But over half of the board presidents could not specifically describe how the component actually worked in their districts, or how it has modified how teachers teach.

Superintendents viewed this component as having the potential to create tensions among teachers and principals. They were strongly supportive of the evaluation process and believed that more frequent evaluations of teachers would improve the quality of the teaching performance in the schools. But approximately 30 percent of the superintendents interviewed expressed concern about the linkage of performance evaluation with money. As one superintendent said:

> I would feel more comfortable if we could evaluate our teachers without having money involved. I would like to evaluate for assessment without worrying about denying some teacher much needed extra money. It is difficult to figure out how to reward good teaching and at the same time encourage continued improvement.

The majority of superintendents stated that the Performance Bonus component is important to teachers' work by making evaluation a more central concern of teachers. Repeatedly, superintendents said they believed that more frequent evaluations, a consistent and uniform approach throughout the district, and principal and teacher training in the evaluation instrument contributed to improved teaching performance in their schools.

Respondents believe that the work of the principals has been greatly increased by this component. Superintendents and board presidents pointed out that principals were responsible for more classroom visits, increased supervision of teachers and increased involvement with the teacher/learning process. In many districts, the paperwork increase for principals was tremendous. Several superintendents stated that their principals had a 10 percent to 25 percent increase in the paperwork required by the CLS in general; a large percentage of this increase associated with the evaluation accompanying the Performance Bonus component. As one superintendent said:

> The dossier plan we used last year did our principals in. One line of evidence was a report from the principal. One thousand teachers submitted a dossier -- a lot of additional paperwork for principals to complete on top of all their other responsibilities.

Career Ladder Levels

This component was the least understood by board presidents. When they were asked how the ladder levels work in their district, approximately 50 percent said they knew the district used this component, but they were not sure how it actually worked. A common response was, "I can't explain it very well. I really don't know much about this one."

Superintendents described a range of ladder designs which went from a duplication of the step and column salary scale with teachers placed on a three level ladder based on number of years of teaching experience and degrees to ladder levels determined by a combination of expanded job responsibilities and evaluation ratings.

But it was clear from the telephone surveys that the majority of superintendents view this component more from a theoretical perspective than from a full understanding of how to most effectively utilize the ladders concept for real reform efforts in their districts. As one superintendent said when asked if his district participates in this component:

> Well, we do if you want to call it levels. Step one is for first and second year teachers. Step two is for teachers in

> their third through sixth years. Step three is for our senior teachers. But it is really our salary scale. It hasn't done much to change teaching in our district.

But several superintendents described using the ladder to give increased responsibilities to deserving senior teachers or associating the mentor teacher system in their districts with the ladder levels. As one superintendent said:

> The Career Ladder Levels have changed how the principal works with hi staff. He now has the specialists he can count on, so our schools are managed more by a team than they ever were before.

In describing the implementation procedures associated with this component superintendent and board president responses indicated that this component has been difficult to implement and remains the least understood of the components of the CLS by teachers. It is clear that the Career Ladder Levels component continues to need district and state level efforts for more effective implementation.

Incentive Funding for Teacher Shortages

Only two districts participated in this component during the 1986-87 school year. The superintendents and board presidents from the two districts which were involved with this component valued it highly. They viewed this component as effectively allowing their districts to identify areas of critical instructional needs and to expand the curriculum where necessary. As one board president said:

> We couldn't provide our students with the courses they need without this additional funding. We now have teachers in chemistry, electronics, and graphic arts where before we couldn't provide that instruction.

Process by which Teachers, Administrators, and Community Groups Received Information About the Program

The most commonly reported way teachers and administrators received information about the CLS is through a series of meetings held by the district administration. It is clear that districts spend a tremendous amount of energy informing teachers and principals about the program, changes in implementation procedures, and changes in state directives concerning the policy. According to the survey data,the two most common means of communication described by superintendents are meetings and newsletters. Principals attend meetings at the district offices and then direct meetings for teachers at their schools. Parents are informed through local newspaper articles and PTA meetings.

Variation exists in the level of community involvement in the CLS. All of the superintendents reported that parents were involved in the district-wide Career Ladder Planning Committees. On an average, board presidents reported that between two and three parents would sit on the district committee. Both superintendents and board presidents believed that teachers, principals and interested community members in their district have direct access to information concerning the CLS.

Statements to the Legislature

There was a strong consensus among board presidents and superintendents concerning the statements they would make to the legislature about the Career Ladder System. Ninety-five percent of superintendents and 90 percent of the board presidents said keep on funding the program. Their reasons were varied, but the major reasons stated were the money is well spent and the CLS is improving the profession for teachers. As one superintendent said:

> I'd hate to see this disappear. I'm an advocate of Career Ladders. It has the potential to strengthen the profession and to reward excellence. I know it has made a big difference in my district. The teachers are happier, the principals are more actively involved with teachers than they were before and we can do things for students we simply couldn't before.

It was not unanimous agreement. Two superintendents said they would like to see the Career Ladder System disappear and have the money go directly to the districts for school reform efforts. In districts where there has been implementation difficulties, board presidents were concerned about the issue of teacher morale. As one board president said:

> I sometimes think we are more supportive of this program than the teachers are. There has been teacher criticism of the plan and that bothers me. After all, it is supposed to be for them.

But the general result of the telephone surveys was strong support for the continuation of the Career Ladder System in Utah on the part of superintendents and board presidents.

APPENDIX B

Teacher and Principal Survey Data

SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS

The tables found at the end of this section of our report cover the entire set of principal and teacher survey responses. The data reported in Tables B1 through B5 cover the experience and work setting of the educators who responded to the survey. Tables B6 through B30 report the views of Utah educators regarding the effectiveness and desirability of the overall Career Ladder System and its individual components.

The data presented in these tables is extensive and rich with insights into the backgrounds, experiences and attitudes of a broad cross-section of Utah educators. While extensive and time-consuming multivariate statistical analysis would be required to fully describe the results of this survey, the following statements capture the most significant findings supported by this survey data:

1. Principals and teachers responding to this survey have the expected age and gender distribution.

The average teacher in Utah is between 36 and 40 years of age; about five years younger than the school principal. As in other states, the teaching staff in Utah is predominantly female (64.1%), while male principals out-number females about 4 to 1.

2. Teachers and principals have about the expected tenure in their current jobs (12.8 and 7.68 years respectively).

Utah educators tend to remain in one school district for most of their careers. Average time in their current school district is only about one-half year less than total time in the principalship, and just over two years less than total time in teaching.

3. The typical school principal holds a Master of Education degree; about two-thirds of all teachers hold no more than a bachelor's degree.

4. As expected, more than 50 percent of all teachers and two-thirds of the principals surveyed work in elementary schools.

Since elementary schools are typically smaller, there are a proportionately larger number of elementary principals. Junior high or middle schools employ about one-fifth of the principals and an equal proportion of the teachers. Senior high schools, with about one-eighth of the principals, employ more than 22 percent of the teachers.

5. Utah educators are fairly evenly spread across urban, suburban and rural communities. A majority report that they work in "middle income" areas.

6. As shown in Table B2, teachers responding to this survey report substantial benefits from the Career Ladder System.

The actual numbers reported by survey respondents differ somewhat from the salary study reported in the Summary of Research Findings section of this report. Only 87.6 percent of those returning surveys indicated that they had received Extended Contract money. Accounting data from ten districts indicate that less than .5 percent of all teachers were excluded from Extended Contract compensation. It is a bit difficult to account for this discrepancy. Perhaps the ten districts studied are not representative (though they contain more than two-thirds of Utah's teachers). Possibly the teachers surveyed did not recognize some of their salary payment as Extended Contract money, or maybe they simply did not remember receiving it. Total Extended Contract compensation was also a bit lower than found in salary data, but the amounts are of a similar magnitude.

Performance Bonus payments reported by the teachers surveyed were quite a bit larger than those found in the salary study. This difference is largely the result of the confusion between Performance Bonus and Career Ladder Level payments that exist in many districts. Total compensation reported (not counting the Job Enlargement payments that were unreliably reported due to a confusion about the survey question format) averaged $1,511.33. This is somewhat larger than the $1,286.86 found in the salary study.

Teachers reported being on any of eight different Career Ladder Levels (0 through 7). About a third reported being on Level 3, another third were on either Level 2 or Level 4.

7. As indicated on Table B3, when asked to indicate the most important criteria used in their districts to place teachers on a Career Ladder Level, the majority of both principals and teachers gave answers that fell into one of five broad categories. They indicated that the most important criteria were:

   - education level or acquisition of college credits,

   - tenure or years of teaching experience,

   - evaluation or assessment of teacher performance,

   - evaluation or assessment of proposed projects, or

   - the willingness to apply and comply with regulations.

While many respondents identified criteria that could not be classified as fitting into one of these five basic themes, these five account for nearly two-thirds of all responses to this question.

Clearly, the Career Ladder Levels component of the Utah Career Ladder System has not gotten completely away from traditional tenure and college credit criteria for salary advancement. Among both principals and teachers, about half cited these as the most important criteria for Career Ladder Level placement. Less than 20 percent offered any other consistent reason for placement.

8. When asked how teachers used their Extended Contract Days, both principals and teachers report that about half the days were spent in individual teacher planning and preparation.

As shown in Table B4, one to one and a half days was spent on various in-service activities and workshops. A similar amount of time was spent on grading, recordkeeping and paperwork. Less than a day was invested in parent conferencing -- still less on other activities.

9. Curriculum development or alignment was the most frequently reported activity supported by Job Enlargement component funds.

As shown in Table B5 about one teacher in eight spent at least some time doing curriculum development work under this component. An additional four to five percent of all teachers spent job enlargement time working on district committees -- most frequently the Career Ladder Planning Committee. About one teacher in 12 served as a lead or mentor teacher; another one in 12 did some other activity under this part of the Career Ladder System.

10. As indicated in Tables B6 through B30, teachers were generally less enthusiastic about the Career Ladder System than principals.

While differences in judgement are typically less than half a point on the five point scale used for assessing the overall impact of the Career Ladder System, they were statistically significant in the vast majority of cases.

On 31 of the 98 questions asking for assessment of the impact and effectiveness of the Career Ladder System, the mean score for the teacher group was below 3.00. This means that more teachers indicated a negative view than a positive one on these 31 items. Twenty of these 31 low scores occurred in the teacher assessments of the total Career Ladder System (i.e. questions 1 through 34). A review of these 20 low means reveals an important pattern in teacher views. Teachers gave positive responses to items dealing with individual opportunity and personal benefits, but they tended not to agree that the Career Ladder System has had a positive effect on organizational dimensions of the school. While teachers agree that the CLS has created a multi-level compensation system and has increased the frequency and effectiveness of teacher evaluation, they do not agree that it has improved school climates, increased student learning, enabled them to spend more time with students or to interact more frequently with other teachers. They do not believe the system has improved teacher morale, improved parent support for the schools, or improved the day-to-day operation of the schools.

These negative feelings do not lead to a general rejection of the CLS. To the contrary, teachers support its continuation by a nearly two to one margin (see Table B10).

11. Teachers who receive pay under one of the CLS components indicate a much stronger level of support for that component than do other teachers.

The vast majority of teachers paid for Extended Days indicate a desire for continuation of this component by a score of 4.40 to 3.89 for those not receiving Extended Day compensation. Receiving Job Enlargement support raised support for continuation of this component from 3.32 to 3.88. In the case of the Performance Bonus component, those not receiving funds were slightly negative in their support for continuation with a mean score of 2.92, while those receiving Bonus money favored continuation with a mean score of 3.52.

12. Regression analysis (not shown in the attached tables) indicates that support for the Career Ladder System and its various components varies sharply from district to district. Moreover, within district support for the CLS is heavily influenced by identifiable personal, economic and policy factors.

About 30 percent of the variation in support for the CLS among principals (29.8%, to be precise) is related to their district of employment. Of this amount, about half can be explained by variables which were assessed in the survey. Three factors related to the principal's school community are important: 1) the wealth of the community as measured by its assessed valuation per student, 2) the local tax effort made by residents of the community as measured by the size of its voted leeway, and 3) whether the community is rural, suburban or urban in character. Poorer, more urban districts with higher voted leeways are most likely to be supportive of the CLS.

Three factors related to local district implementation of the CLS also affect the level of principal support for its continuation. These factors are: the number of extended contract days provided by the district, the percentage of the total CLS budget devoted to performance bonus payments, and the number of lines of evidence required for teachers to qualify for a career ladder level promotion. Where districts add to the state supported extended contract days, support for the CLS goes up. Support declines as a larger proportion of the budget is used for Performance Bonuses, and as the number of lines of evidence used for teacher evaluation increases.

One personal factor, age, also influences the principals' support for the CLS. Older principals are significantly less likely to support the CLS.

Among teachers, only about 20 percent of the total variance in their support for the CLS can be explained by inter-district differences. Of this amount, 9.1 percent can be explained by community, policy and personal characteristics.

Poorer districts (as measured both by assessed valuation per pupil and the teachers judgement of community socio-economic status) and those experiencing enrollment increases over the last four years are more likely to have teachers who support the CLS.

Two factors related to the implementation of the CLS in each district also affect the level of teacher support. Districts with a larger percentage of their CLS budget in the Career Ladder Levels component, especially when those districts use fewer lines of evidence for teacher evaluation, tend to have more supportive teachers.

As with principals, the teacher's age is a significant factor influencing support for the CLS. Younger teachers are significantly more supportive than older ones. With teachers, gender is also an important factor. Female teachers are more supportive of the CLS than male teachers.

Table B1. Sample Demographics

	Principals			Teachers		
Questionnaire Item	Mean	(Pct)		Mean	(Pct)	
Age:						
Less than 25	0	.0%		21	2.2%	*
25 to 30	6	1.3%	*	137	14.7%	*******
31 to 35	44	9.2%	*****	150	16.1%	********
36 to 40 (50th % for Tchr)	97	20.3%	*********	170	18.2%	*********
41 to 45 (50th % for Prin)	97	20.3%	*********	161	17.2%	*********
46 to 50	86	18.0%	*********	121	13.0%	******
51 to 56	95	19.9%	*********	106	11.3%	******
56 to 60	45	9.4%	*****	56	6.0%	***
61 or Older	7	1.5%	*	12	1.3%	*
Gender:						
Female	101	21.4%	**	590	64.1%	******
Male	371	78.6%	********	330	35.9%	****
Avg. Years in Pres. Position:	7.68	(sd=6.8)		12.80	(sd=7.4)	
Avg. Years in School District:	7.13	(sd=6.7)		10.60	(sd=7.1)	
Highest Degree Held:						
BA/BS	16	3.4%	*	621	66.6%	*********
MA/MS	90	19.2%	***	142	15.2%	**
M Ed	231	49.4%	*******	148	15.9%	**
PhD/EdD	63	13.5%	**	8	.9%	
Other (generally Ed S)	68	14.5%	**	14	1.5%	
Type of School Served:						
Elementary	306	66.5%	*********	502	54.3%	********
Jr. or Middle School	87	18.9%	***	198	21.4%	***
High School	58	12.6%	**	211	22.8%	***
Other/Special	9	2.0%		13	1.4%	
Type of Community Served:						
Large City	74	15.9%	**	172	18.9%	***
Suburb	155	33.3%	*****	365	40.1%	******
Small Town	135	29.0%	****	243	26.7%	****
Rural Community	102	21.9%	***	131	14.4%	**
Socio-Economics of Community:						
Wealthy	26	5.7%	*	51	5.7%	*
Middle Income	230	50.0%	********	505	56.1%	********
Lower Income/Employed	153	33.3%	*****	248	27.6%	****
Low Income/High Unemployment	51	11.1%	**	96	10.7%	**

Table B2. Teacher Benefits from the Career Ladder System

Questionnaire Item	No. Tchrs Reporting		Total	Pct. or (s.d.)
Paid for Extended Contract Days.	924	Number:	830	87.6%
		Avg. No. of Days:	5.97	(2.89)
Daily rate paid.	492	Dollars:	$108.29	($32.07)
Total Extended Contract income.	443	Dollars:	$658.18	($383.15)
Paid a Performance Bonus.	910	Number:	404	44.4%
Total Performance Bonus income.	336	Dollars:	$853.15	($505.63)
Paid for Job Enlargement work.	894	Number:	339	37.9%
Total Job Enlargement income.		(not reliably reported)		
Level on District Career Ladder.	616			
Reported Level 0:	34	5.5%	***	
Reported Level 1:	72	11.7%	******	
Reported Level 2:	97	15.7%	********	
Reported Level 3:	198	32.1%	****************	
Reported Level 4:	112	18.2%	*********	
Reported Level 5:	87	14.1%	*******	
Reported Level 6:	14	2.3%	*	
Reported Level 7:	2	.3%		

Table B3. Criteria Used to Place Teachers on Career Ladder

(Combined totals for all criteria mentioned)

Criteria	Principals Reports			Teachers Reports		
Teacher education level, no. of college credits.	173	27%	********	261	25%	*******
Years of teaching experience/tenure.	143	23%	*******	272	26%	********
Evaluation/assessment of the teacher.	40	6%	**	93	9%	***
Evaluation/approval of proposed projects.	33	5%	**	58	6%	**
Willingness to apply/ comply with process.	10	2%		22	2%	*
All other criteria.	232	37%	***********	341	33%	**********

Table B4. Reported Uses of Extended Contract Days

Questionnaire Item	Principals			Teachers		
	Mean	(s.d.)		Mean	(s.d.)	
Individual teacher planning and preparation.	2.82	(2.05)	*******	2.39	(2.25)	******
Inservice activities & workshops.	1.52	(1.77)	****	1.21	(1.82)	***
Grading, recordkeeping & paperwork.	1.23	(1.56)	***	1.52	(1.82)	****
Parent conferencing.	.57	(1.02)	*	.50	(0.94)	*
Orientation meetings at school.	.30	(0.65)	*	.47	(0.85)	*
Direct work with students.	.17	(1.07)		.26	(1.36)	*
Other....	.15	(0.82)		.13	(1.02)	

Table B5. Reported Job Enlargement Task Engagement

Questionnaire Item	Principals Reporting Use	Teachers Reporting Work
Curriculum alignment/development.	76.2% ********	13.7% ********
Career Ladder Planning Committee.	51.0% *****	4.7% ***
Other District committees.	50.8% *****	4.6% ***
Teacher Mentor or Lead Teachers.	50.0% *****	7.3% ****
Computer or other technology proj.	40.9% ****	1.6% *
Student assessment activities.	25.8% ***	3.6% **
Master Learning Coordinators.	23.3% **	1.1% *
Summer school teaching.	18.6% **	1.3% *
Ombudsman or community relations work.	9.9% *	.5%
Other activities	14.0% *	8.6% *****

Table B6. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether: The Career Ladder System is effective in providing...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
1. Multi-level compensation for teachers.	Disagree	5.7 **	3.72	12.8 ****	3.37
		10.1 ***		13.1 ****	
	Neutral	16.4 *****		21.3 ******	
		41.7 *************		30.1 *********	
	Agree	26.1 ********		22.7 *******	
4. More frequent teacher evaluations.	Disagree	5.8 **	3.69	11.1 ***	3.41
		10.7 ***		13.5 ****	
	Neutral	20.9 ******		21.3 ******	
		34.3 **********		31.6 *********	
	Agree	28.3 ********		22.5 *******	
5. More effective teacher evaluations.	Disagree	6.6 **	3.61	18.8 ******	3.03
		12.2 ****		17.5 *****	
	Neutral	20.2 ******		20.7 ******	
		35.3 ***********		28.0 ********	
	Agree	25.7 ********		15.0 *****	
8. A positive climate for learning.	Disagree	6.2 **	3.40	16.6 *****	3.05
		9.9 ***		15.6 *****	
	Neutral	34.2 *********		28.1 ********	
		36.9 ***********		25.7 ********	
	Agree	12.8 ****		14.0 ****	
7. A strong student instructional program.	Disagree	5.8 **	3.40	16.5 *****	3.02
		12.4 ****		18.7 ******	
	Neutral	30.1 *********		25.1 ********	
		39.6 ************		26.1 ********	
	Agree	12.1 ****		13.6 ****	
3. Teacher incentives, if continued for 5 years.	Disagree	9.9 ***	3.35	23.6 *******	2.86
		15.9 *****		17.4 *****	
	Neutral	22.1 *******		22.2 *******	
	years.	33.9 **********		23.1 *******	
	Agree	18.2 *****		13.7 ****	
9. A positive work environment for teachers.	Disagree	8.8 ***	3.27	22.9 *******	2.87
		15.4 *****		19.7 ******	
	Neutral	31.1 *********		19.7 ******	
		29.8 *********		23.2 *******	
	Agree	14.9 ****		14.5 ****	
2. Incentives for good teachers to remain.	Disagree	10.9 ***	3.26	25.7 ********	2.77
		16.5 *****		18.5 ******	
	Neutral	23.3 *******		21.5 ******	
		34.8 **********		21.5 ******	
	Agree	14.5 ****		12.8 ****	
11. Strong leadership for schools.	Disagree	8.9 ***	3.24	21.2 ******	2.86
		15.8 *****		17.8 *****	
	Neutral	30.6 *********		27.1 ********	
		31.6 *********		21.6 ******	
	Agree	13.1 ****		12.3 ****	
6. A comprehensive district curriculum.	Disagree	12.2 ****	3.00	21.3 ******	2.75
		19.0 ******		19.9 ******	
	Neutral	33.7 *********		30.6 *********	
		26.4 ********		18.7 ******	
	Agree	8.7 ***		9.5 ***	
10. A positive work environment for principals.	Disagree	16.0 *****	2.86	16.8 *****	2.89
		24.8 *******		18.6 ******	
	Neutral	25.9 ********		34.7 *********	
		23.8 *******		19.1 ******	
	Agree	9.5 ***		10.8 ***	

Table B7. Teacher Responses to:
The Career Ladder System has enabled me to...

Questionnaire Item		Pct.		Mean Score
13. Prepare better curriculum materials.	Disagree	16.6	*****	3.31
		13.3	****	
	Neutral	17.7	*****	
		27.8	********	
	Agree	24.6	*******	
22. Advance in responsibility and pay.	Disagree	18.1	*****	3.29
		10.6	***	
	Neutral	17.5	*****	
		32.2	**********	
	Agree	21.6	******	
12. Teach more effectively.	Disagree	22.3	*******	3.06
		13.4	****	
	Neutral	18.7	******	
		27.1	********	
	Agree	18.5	******	
21. Be rewarded for outstanding teaching.	Disagree	24.9	*******	3.01
		12.9	****	
	Neutral	17.6	*****	
		25.9	********	
	Agree	18.7	******	
14. Monitor student achievement effectively.	Disagree	19.0	******	2.99
		17.8	*****	
	Neutral	24.0	*******	
		23.4	*******	
	Agree	15.8	*****	
17. Work effectively with the principal.	Disagree	19.5	******	2.94
		16.6	*****	
	Neutral	27.2	********	
		24.0	*******	
	Agree	12.7	****	
16. work effectively with other teachers.	Disagree	23.4	*******	2.85
		17.0	*****	
	Neutral	23.6	*******	
		23.5	*******	
	Agree	12.5	****	
23. Complete record-keeping and paperwork.	Disagree	28.9	*********	2.79
		15.0	*****	
	Neutral	20.0	******	
		20.2	******	
	Agree	15.9	*****	
18. Work effectively with parents.	Disagree	22.9	*******	2.72
		17.0	*****	
	Neutral	34.2	**********	
		17.1	*****	
	Agree	8.8	***	
24. Understand how I fit into district plans.	Disagree	29.5	*********	2.55
		17.8	*****	
	Neutral	29.7	*********	
		14.7	****	
	Agree	8.3	**	
15. Spend time with individual students.	Disagree	32.9	**********	2.43
		21.7	*******	
	Neutral	23.6	*******	
		13.5	****	
	Agree	8.3	**	
20. Be observed by other teachers.	Disagree	36.4	***********	2.38
		18.7	******	
	Neutral	23.2	*******	
		14.4	****	
	Agree	7.3	**	
19. Observe other teachers in classrooms.	Disagree	41.7	*************	2.20
		19.9	******	
	Neutral	21.4	******	
		10.5	***	
	Agree	6.5	**	

Table B8. Principal Responses to:

The Career Ladder System has enabled me to...

Questionnaire Item		Pct.		Mean Score
22. Use teachers' skills effectively.	Disagree	4.3	*	3.67
		7.9	**	
	Neutral	25.0	********	
		41.7	*************	
	Agree	21.1	******	
21. Reward outstanding teaching.	Disagree	7.2	**	3.61
		10.3	***	
	Neutral	20.3	******	
		38.6	************	
	Agree	23.6	*******	
12. Evaluate teachers more effectively.	Disagree	7.4	**	3.54
		12.6	****	
	Neutral	23.1	*******	
		32.6	**********	
	Agree	24.3	*******	
16. Work effectively with teachers.	Disagree	6.6	**	3.42
		15.4	*****	
	Neutral	24.7	*******	
		35.6	***********	
	Agree	17.7	*****	
13. Provide stronger curricula for students.	Disagree	6.4	**	3.35
		12.8	****	
	Neutral	33.7	**********	
		34.0	**********	
	Agree	13.1	****	
15. Coordinate school & district objectives.	Disagree	6.4	**	3.35
		16.4	*****	
	Neutral	27.2	********	
		35.7	***********	
	Agree	14.3	****	
24. Improve overall school climate.	Disagree	9.1	***	3.26
		16.3	*****	
	Neutral	28.5	*********	
		32.2	**********	
	Agree	13.9	****	
20. Share evaluation with teachers.	Disagree	11.1	***	3.21
		16.3	*****	
	Neutral	26.7	********	
		32.1	**********	
	Agree	13.8	****	
19. Retain excellent teachers.	Disagree	9.3	***	3.18
		16.1	*****	
	Neutral	32.8	**********	
		30.5	*********	
	Agree	11.3	***	
14. Monitor student achievement effectively.	Disagree	7.6	**	3.17
		16.9	*****	
	Neutral	35.6	***********	
		31.1	*********	
	Agree	8.8	***	
17. Work effectively with district administrators.	Disagree	8.9	***	3.01
		18.4	******	
	Neutral	41.9	************	
		24.5	*******	
	Agree	6.3	**	
18. Work effectively with parents.	Disagree	10.1	***	2.92
		20.1	******	
	Neutral	42.4	************	
		22.8	*******	
	Agree	4.6	*	
23. Complete record-keeping and school management.	Disagree	13.3	****	2.87
		23.0	*******	
	Neutral	35.6	***********	
		20.1	******	
	Agree	8.0	**	

Table B9. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whe

The Career Ladder System in my school has improved...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teache Opinio
29. Teacher leadership opportunities.	Disagree	1.9 *		13.0 **
		7.3 **		13.6 **
	Neutral	14.8 ****	3.91	20.8 **
		49.5 ***************		34.0 **
	Agree	26.5 *********		18.6 **
33. The teacher evaluation process.	Disagree	6.3 **		17.5 **
		11.2 ***		15.8 **
	Neutral	22.4 *******	3.59	20.9 **
		37.7 ************		28.2 **
	Agree	22.4 *******		17.6 **
25. The overall instructional program.	Disagree	4.1 *		17.3 **
		8.3 **		16.5 **
	Neutral	30.9 **********	3.57	25.0 **
		40.0 *************		27.9 **
	Agree	16.7 *****		13.3 **
30. Principal's role as instructional leader.	Disagree	5.6 **		19.3 **
		10.0 ***		17.3 **
	Neutral	28.8 **********	3.52	30.9 **
		38.4 *************		22.4 **
	Agree	17.2 *****		10.1 **
26. Attention to student academic progress.	Disagree	3.7 *		16.6 **
		8.9 ***		16.3 **
	Neutral	32.9 **********	3.51	24.4 **
		42.0 **************		29.2 **
	Agree	12.5 ****		13.5 **
27. Student achievement.	Disagree	4.0 *		16.5 **
		11.5 ***		16.9 **
	Neutral	39.2 **********	3.36	30.3 **
		35.0 ************		25.4 **
	Agree	10.3 ***		10.9 **
32. The morale of teachers.	Disagree	12.0 ****		32.6 **
		19.0 ******		16.9 **
	Neutral	23.2 *******	3.18	16.8 **
		31.1 **********		20.1 **
	Agree	14.7 ****		13.6 **
31. Day-to-day operations of the school.	Disagree	6.9 **		22.5 **
		19.3 ******		19.7 **
	Neutral	42.9 **********	3.08	32.5 **
		21.0 ******		17.1 **
	Agree	9.9 ***		8.2 **
28. Parent support.	Disagree	4.6 *		22.5 **
		18.0 *****		18.5 **
	Neutral	51.4 **********	3.05	38.6 **
		20.3 ******		15.7 **
	Agree	5.7 **		4.7 *

Table B10. Global Assessment of the Career Ladder System.

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
34. Career Ladder System should be continued.	Disagree	8.8 ***	3.85	19.6 ******	3.46
		6.5 **		9.3 ***	
	Neutral	16.8 *****		14.9 ****	
		27.0 ********		17.7 *****	
	Agree	40.9 ************		38.5 ************	

Table B11. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

Extended Contract increases teacher opportunities to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
35. Plan for classroom instruction.	Disagree	2.1 *		3.9 *	
		3.1 *		3.5 *	
	Neutral	5.4 **	4.36	7.2 **	4.37
		35.1 ***********		22.9 *******	
	Agree	54.3 **************		62.5 **************	
36. Develop curriculum.	Disagree	2.1 *		4.0 *	
		3.9 *		4.7 *	
	Neutral	10.8 ***	4.20	11.1 ***	4.23
		38.0 ***********		24.4 *******	
	Agree	45.2 **************		55.8 **************	
37. Participate in professional development.	Disagree	1.9 *		5.2 **	
		3.1 *		7.7 **	
	Neutral	15.1 *****	4.15	17.8 *****	3.95
		37.8 ***********		25.4 ********	
	Agree	42.1 *************		43.9 *************	
38. Take care of record keeping & paperwork.	Disagree	2.9 *		6.4 **	
		6.9 **		5.2 **	
	Neutral	13.9 ****	4.07	10.1 ***	4.16
		32.6 **********		22.6 *******	
	Agree	43.7 *************		55.7 **************	
40. Communicate with Parents.	Disagree	4.2 *		10.9 ***	
		11.0 ***		11.9 ****	
	Neutral	30.8 *********	3.57	27.1 ********	3.41
		31.8 **********		25.3 ********	
	Agree	22.2 *******		24.8 *******	
39. Provide additional student instruction.	Disagree	6.4 **		15.7 *****	
		14.1 ****		14.4 ****	
	Neutral	31.2 *********	3.41	21.6 ******	3.28
		28.5 *********		23.3 *******	
	Agree	19.8 ******		25.0 ********	

Table B12. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

Extended Contract effectively helps principals to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
42. Work more effectively with teachers.	Disagree	5.4 **		8.0 **	
		6.4 **		10.7 ***	
	Neutral	22.7 *******	3.73	30.2 *********	3.46
		41.0 ************		29.9 *********	
	Agree	24.5 *******		21.2 ******	
44. Maintain a smooth running school.	Disagree	6.2 **		8.8 ***	
		7.5 **		8.3 **	
	Neutral	31.6 *********	3.58	33.9 *********	3.44
		31.8 **********		28.1 ********	
	Agree	22.9 *******		20.9 ******	
41. Carry out critical management tasks.	Disagree	9.8 ***		6.9 **	
		11.6 ***		9.0 ***	
	Neutral	27.9 ********	3.41	34.6 *********	3.48
		29.1 *********		28.5 *********	
	Agree	21.6 ******		21.0 ******	
43. Work more effectively with parents.	Disagree	7.7 **		10.0 ***	
		17.3 *****		10.9 ***	
	Neutral	40.3 *********	3.13	42.2 *********	3.22
		24.1 *******		20.9 ******	
	Agree	10.6 ***		16.0 *****	

Table B13. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

Extended Contract effectively allows the district to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
45. Accomplish district planning & management.	Disagree	4.4 *		8.3 **	
		10.5 ***		10.1 ***	
	Neutral	24.1 *******	3.68	34.7 *********	3.39
		34.7 **********		28.5 *********	
	Agree	26.3 ********		18.4 ******	
46. Communicate more effectively with parents.	Disagree	7.3 **		12.5 ****	
		18.4 ******		14.9 ****	
	Neutral	45.2 *********	3.06	44.1 *********	3.00
		19.7 ******		17.0 *****	
	Agree	9.4 ***		11.5 ***	

Table B14 Global assessment of Extended Contract Component

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
	Disagree	2.9 *		5.1 **	
		3.1 *		3.0 *	
47. Extended Contract should be continued.	Neutral	9.4 ***	4.34	9.7 ***	4.36
		25.9 ********		15.6 *****	
	Agree	58.7 ***************		66.6 ***************	

Table B15. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

The Performance Bonus is an incentive for teachers to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
50. Understand teacher evaluation better.	Disagree	8.0 **	3.54	19.7 ******	3.11
		10.8 ***		12.1 ****	
	Neutral	20.7 ******		23.4 *******	
		40.7 ************		27.5 ********	
	Agree	19.8 ******		17.3 *****	
49. Care more about the quality of teaching.	Disagree	7.8 **	3.43	23.1 *******	3.05
		13.5 ****		12.3 ****	
	Neutral	24.3 *******		20.1 ******	
		36.7 ***********		25.2 ********	
	Agree	17.7 *****		19.3 ******	
51. Observe other teachers in their rooms.	Disagree	9.1 ***	3.17	32.5 **********	2.47
		19.3 ******		19.3 ******	
	Neutral	30.7 *********		25.1 ********	
		27.8 ********		14.8 ****	
	Agree	13.1 ****		8.3 **	
48. Remain in the teaching profession.	Disagree	12.3 ****	3.14	29.9 *********	2.69
		18.4 ******		15.4 *****	
	Neutral	25.8 ********		23.4 *******	
		30.2 *********		18.2 *****	
	Agree	13.3 ****		13.1 ****	
52. Be observed by other teachers.	Disagree	10.8 ***	3.14	30.8 *********	2.55
		18.8 ******		17.5 *****	
	Neutral	29.8 *********		26.4 ********	
		27.1 ********		16.4 *****	
	Agree	13.5 ****		8.9 ***	

Table B16. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

The Performance Bonus effectively helps principals to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
	Disagree	7.6 **		21.8 *******	
		10.3 ***		13.3 ****	
54. Improve instruction in the school.	Neutral	23.0 *******	3.55	23.0 *******	3.00
		38.2 ************		27.4 ********	
	Agree	20.9 ******		14.5 ****	
	Disagree	8.7 **		18.5 ******	
		10.4 ***		12.4 ****	
55. Carry out better teacher evaluation.	Neutral	22.8 *******	3.55	21.2 ******	3.18
		35.7 ************		28.2 ********	
	Agree	20.9 ******		19.7 ******	
	Disagree	9.9 ***		23.3 ******	
		12.3 ****		14.1 ****	
53. Reward excellent teaching.	Neutral	19.0 ******	3.48	19.2 ******	3.04
		37.2 ************		26.6 ********	
	Agree	21.6 ******		16.8 *****	

Table B17. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

The Performance Bonus effectively allows the district to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
57. Ensure fair teacher evaluations.	Disagree	12.7 ****	3.17	28.5 *********	2.69
		15.7 *****		17.5 *****	
	Neutral	27.1 ********		22.1 *******	
		31.1 *********		20.2 ******	
	Agree	13.4 ****		11.7 ****	
56. Retain excellent teachers.	Disagree	12.0 ****	3.15	27.8 ********	2.72
		16.7 *****		16.3 *****	
	Neutral	29.7 *********		24.5 *******	
		27.8 ********		19.2 ******	
	Agree	13.8 ****		12.2 ****	
58. Improve the morale of teachers.	Disagree	18.2 *****	2.96	34.5 **********	2.57
		18.8 ******		16.8 *****	
	Neutral	25.2 ********		19.0 ******	
		24.7 *******		17.1 *****	
	Agree	13.1 ****		12.6 ****	

Table B18. Global Assessment of the Performance Bonus

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
	Disagree	15.9 *****		24.5 *******	
		10.6 ***		9.3 ***	
59. The Performance Bonus should be continued.	Neutral	19.5 ******	3.44	17.8 *****	3.20
		21.6 ******		18.4 ******	
	Agree	32.4 **********		30.0 *********	

Table B19. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

Job enlargement is an effective incentive for teachers to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
63. Be paid for work they once did for no pay.	Disagree	1.9 *		8.0 **	
		2.1 *		4.3 *	
	Neutral	8.7 ***	4.35	14.7 ****	3.99
		33.3 **********		27.1 ********	
	Agree	54.0 **************		45.9 **************	
61. Share school leadership responsibilities.	Disagree	2.3 *		11.8 ****	
		5.1 **		10.0 ***	
	Neutral	13.9 ****	4.02	22.7 *******	3.43
		45.9 **************		34.2 **********	
	Agree	32.8 **********		21.3 ******	
60. Use professional skills more effectively.	Disagree	2.3 *		12.3 ****	
		4.2 *		10.8 ***	
	Neutral	15.2 *****	4.00	25.7 ********	3.35
		47.6 **************		32.0 **********	
	Agree	30.7 *********		19.2 ******	
64. Better serve student needs.	Disagree	1.9 *		11.2 ***	
		5.1 **		9.3 ***	
	Neutral	17.6 *****	3.98	25.5 ********	3.46
		43.9 *************		30.5 *********	
	Agree	31.5 *********		23.5 *******	
62. Improve instruction in the school.	Disagree	2.5 *		12.2 ****	
		4.0 *		10.9 ***	
	Neutral	16.9 *****	3.96	27.1 ********	3.32
		48.2 **************		32.0 **********	
	Agree	28.4 *********		17.8 *****	

Table B20. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

Job enlargement effectively helps principals to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)		Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)		Tchr. Mean
68. Use teacher skills effectively.	Disagree	2.5	*	4.03	10.5	***	3.49
		4.9	*		9.8	***	
	Neutral	14.8	****		22.8	*******	
		43.0	*************		33.6	**********	
	Agree	34.8	**********		23.3	*******	
69. Reward excellent teachers.	Disagree	4.2	*	3.84	16.0	*****	3.23
		7.6	**		13.0	****	
	Neutral	18.2	*****		23.5	*******	
		39.8	************		27.0	********	
	Agree	30.2	*********		20.5	******	
66. Improve the student learning environment.	Disagree	2.3	*	3.78	11.5	***	3.24
		6.5	**		10.7	***	
	Neutral	24.7	*******		34.2	*********	
		43.5	*************		29.4	*********	
	Agree	23.0	*******		14.2	****	
67. Improve student academic achievement.	Disagree	2.1	*	3.69	12.3	****	3.17
		6.1	**		11.0	***	
	Neutral	32.2	*********		36.5	*********	
		39.8	************		28.0	********	
	Agree	19.8	******		12.2	****	
65. Accomplish school management tasks.	Disagree	5.1	**	3.66	10.7	***	3.36
		9.7	***		8.3	**	
	Neutral	25.1	********		32.7	*********	
		34.7	**********		31.1	*********	
	Agree	25.4	********		17.2	*****	

Table B21. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

Job enlargement effectively the district to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
	Disagree	1.9 *		10.2 ***	
		5.9 **		9.7 ***	
72. Use teacher	Neutral	15.4 *****	3.98	26.4 ********	3.45
skills effectively.		46.1 **************		32.8 **********	
	Agree	30.7 *********		20.9 ******	
	Disagree	2.5 *		9.8 ***	
		7.6 **		11.7 ****	
70. Do district curriculum	Neutral	19.5 ******	3.88	31.3 *********	3.34
planning & implementation.		40.1 ************		29.0 *********	
	Agree	30.3 *********		18.2 *****	
	Disagree	5.7 **		18.5 ******	
		11.9 ****		14.1 ****	
73. Retain excellent	Neutral	30.8 *********	3.46	30.1 *********	3.01
teachers.		34.0 **********		22.2 *******	
	Agree	17.6 *****		15.1 *****	
	Disagree	6.2 **		13.8 ****	
		15.9 *****		15.2 *****	
71. Improve parent-school	Neutral	44.2 *********	3.17	42.6 *********	2.94
communications.		21.9 *******		19.8 ******	
	Agree	11.8 ****		8.6 ***	

Table B22. Global Assessment of the Job Enlargement Component

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
	Disagree	4.2 *		13.0 ****	
		6.3 **		6.5 **	
74. Job Enlargement should be continued.	Neutral	13.3 ****	4.08	24.6 *******	3.55
		29.6 *********		24.1 *******	
	Agree	46.6 **************		31.8 **********	

Table 23. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

Career Ladder Levels are incentives for teachers to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)		Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)		Tchr. Mean
	Disagree	3.8	*		18.0	*****	
		12.3	****		12.8	****	
78. Care more about teaching	Neutral	27.6	********	3.53	18.7	******	3.23
		39.3	************		29.7	*********	
	Agree	17.0	*****		20.8	******	
	Disagree	4.5	*		16.0	*****	
		15.3	*****		14.0	****	
77. Carry out district curric	Neutral	31.0	*********	3.37	28.8	*********	3.10
		37.2	***********		26.3	********	
	Agree	12.0	****		14.9	****	
	Disagree	5.5	**		18.5	******	
		16.8	*****		12.5	****	
75. Improve their teaching skills.	Neutral	30.4	*********	3.32	18.7	******	3.20
		34.6	**********		31.0	*********	
	Agree	12.7	****		19.3	******	
	Disagree	5.1	**		21.6	******	
		14.9	****		15.8	*****	
80. Ask the principal for professional help.	Neutral	35.2	*********	3.29	28.8	*********	2.86
		35.5	***********		22.3	*******	
	Agree	9.3	***		11.5	***	
	Disagree	5.9	**		17.9	*****	
		16.3	*****		15.3	*****	
79. Ask for professional help from colleagues.	Neutral	33.1	*********	3.28	26.1	********	3.04
		32.9	**********		26.7	********	
	Agree	11.8	****		14.0	****	
	Disagree	4.2	*		16.8	*****	
		16.1	*****		15.2	*****	
76. Monitor student achievement more systematically.	Neutral	37.4	*********	3.28	24.7	*******	3.10
		32.1	**********		28.3	********	
	Agree	10.2	***		15.0	*****	
	Disagree	7.6	**		20.9	******	
		20.6	******		15.5	*****	
81. Communicate more frequently with parents.	Neutral	38.2	*********	3.04	31.9	*********	2.83
		27.2	********		22.8	*******	
	Agree	6.4	**		8.9	***	

Table B24. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

Career Ladder Levels effectively allow principals to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
83. Improve instruction in the school.	Disagree	3.8 *		17.4 *****	
		11.7 ****		12.6 ****	
	Neutral	29.0 *********	3.55	26.3 ********	3.12
		36.9 ***********		28.2 ********	
	Agree	18.6 ******		15.5 *****	
84. Conduct more thorough evaluation of teachers.	Disagree	5.7 **		14.6 ****	
		12.3 ****		9.8 ***	
	Neutral	25.3 ********	3.55	25.1 ********	3.31
		34.9 **********		31.4 *********	
	Agree	21.8 *******		19.1 ******	
82. Reward excellent teachers.	Disagree	7.0 **		20.4 ******	
		13.8 ****		13.9 ****	
	Neutral	22.9 *******	3.48	21.7 *******	3.07
		36.5 ***********		26.2 ********	
	Agree	19.8 ******		17.8 *****	
85. Carry out day-to-day operations.	Disagree	7.2 **		18.6 ******	
		19.8 ******		16.0 *****	
	Neutral	38.8 *********	3.11	35.1 *********	2.87
		23.7 *******		20.6 ******	
	Agree	10.5 ***		9.7 ***	

Table B25. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

Career Ladder Levels effectively allow the district to...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
87. Ensure a more thorough teacher evaluation system.	Disagree	7.0 **		15.1 *****	
		13.2 ****		13.7 ****	
	Neutral	22.6 *******	3.51	23.1 *******	3.22
		36.7 ***********		30.4 *********	
	Agree	20.5 ******		17.7 *****	
88. Improve the quality of instruction.	Disagree	4.3 *		16.2 *****	
		14.3 ****		13.5 ****	
	Neutral	26.8 ********	3.47	27.5 ********	3.11
		39.4 ************		29.0 *********	
	Agree	15.2 *****		13.8 ****	
89. Increase student academic achievement.	Disagree	4.9 *		16.5 *****	
		14.1 ****		14.6 ****	
	Neutral	35.7 *********	3.33	30.8 *********	3.04
		34.2 **********		24.6 *******	
	Agree	11.1 ***		13.5 ****	
86. Retain excellent teachers.	Disagree	8.8 ***		23.1 *******	
		16.3 *****		14.4 ****	
	Neutral	32.6 *********	3.24	24.7 *******	2.93
		26.8 ********		21.6 ******	
	Agree	15.5 *****		16.2 *****	

Table B26. Global Assessment of the Career Ladder Levels

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
	Disagree	9.2 ***		18.0 *****	
		10.9 ***		10.6 ***	
90. Career Ladder Levels should be continued.	Neutral	20.3 ******	3.64	18.4 ******	3.39
		26.1 ********		20.8 ******	
	Agree	33.5 **********		32.2 **********	

Table B27. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

The District followed fair & reasonable procedures...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
	Disagree	1.0		1.6	
		1.9 *		2.6 *	
91. The Extended Contract Days compontent.	Neutral	5.6 **	4.50	11.9 ****	4.38
		29.5 *********		23.6 *******	
	Agree	62.0 **************		60.3 **************	
	Disagree	1.0		7.9 **	
		4.4 *		7.6 **	
92. The Job Enlargement component.	Neutral	10.9 ***	4.24	27.8 ********	3.62
		36.7 ***********		28.3 ********	
	Agree	47.0 **************		28.4 *********	
	Disagree	2.8 *		11.0 ***	
		5.5 **		10.2 ***	
94. The Career Ladder Levels component.	Neutral	16.3 *****	4.10	21.6 ******	3.55
		29.9 *********		27.4 ********	
	Agree	45.5 **************		29.8 *********	
	Disagree	2.1 *		15.4 *****	
		8.4 ***		10.3 ***	
93. The Performance Bonus component.	Neutral	15.7 *****	4.05	23.0 *******	3.35
		30.4 *********		26.7 ********	
	Agree	43.4 *************		24.6 *******	

Table 28. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding whether:

The District provided application forms & information...

Questionnaire Item		Principal Opinion (%)	Prin. Mean	Teacher Opinion (%)	Tchr. Mean
96. Job Enlargement opportunities.	Disagree	1.3		7.0 **	
		1.5		7.9 **	
	Neutral	6.5 **	4.49	16.7 *****	3.91
		28.6 *********		24.4 *******	
	Agree	62.1 **************		44.0 *************	
97. A Performance Bonus.	Disagree	.8		5.3 **	
		2.5 *		6.9 **	
	Neutral	6.8 **	4.49	15.6 *****	4.01
		26.8 ********		25.8 ********	
	Agree	63.1 **************		46.4 **************	
95. The Extended Contract Days.	Disagree	2.5 *		3.0 *	
		1.5		3.3 *	
	Neutral	7.7 **	4.48	11.4 ***	4.34
		21.9 *******		21.6 ******	
	Agree	66.4 **************		60.7 **************	
98. Advancement on the Career Ladder.	Disagree	1.0		6.2 **	
		2.6 *		6.0 **	
	Neutral	9.4 ***	4.44	13.7 ****	4.04
		25.5 ********		26.0 ********	
	Agree	61.5 **************		48.1 **************	

Table B29. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding:

The most valuable components of the Career Ladder System are...

Questionnaire Item	Principal Pct.		Teacher Pct.	
99. The Extended Contract Days component.	69.4	*****************	72.4	*****************
100. The Job Enlargement component.	44.8	*************	24.6	*******
101. The Performance Bonus component.	23.2	*******	20.7	******
102. The Career Ladder Levels component.	21.1	******	26.7	********
103. -- All components are of equal value.	19.5	******	13.4	****

Table B30. The Views of Principals & Teachers regarding:

The least valuable components of the Career Ladder System are...

Questionnaire Item	Principal Pct.	Teacher Pct.
106. The Performance Bonus component.	43.1 **************	40.3 *************
107. The Career Ladder Levels component.	41.5 *************	29.4 *********
105. The Job Enlargement component.	19.5 ******	32.7 **********
104. The Extended Contract Days component.	6.4 **	6.2 **
108. -- None are of value.	3.1 *	5.3 **

APPENDIX C

Case Study Districts

UTAH'S CAREER LADDER SYSTEM: ANALYSIS OF TWELVE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

In October and November, 1987, Far West Laboratory conducted structured interviews with district administrators, principals, teachers and parents in 12 school districts throughout Utah. The purpose of conducting the case studies was to gain as thorough an understanding as possible of commonalities in the CLS policy impact across many types of districts. Consequently, this report does not provide a district by district discussion of the CLS. Rather, the case studies analysis provides a framework for understanding differences in the way the CLS operates. (See Attachment A: Case Study Protocols)

The 12 case study districts represent urban, suburban, and rural schools and variations in Career Ladder funding patterns. The following role groups participated in interviews that lasted approximately one hour each, talking in depth about the Career Ladder System's impact in their district.

- District administrators: the superintendent, the fiscal and personnel officers, and administrators in charge of curriculum, elementary and secondary divisions, and Career Ladder assignments. A total of 44 district administrators were interviewed.

- Representatives of the district-wide Career Ladder Planning Committee: teachers, principals, district administrators and parents attended these meetings. Seventy-seven Career Ladder Committee members were interviewed.

- Principals: elementary, junior high or middle school, and high school principals were interviewed in all but one district. In one of the smallest districts, the junior high school principal was out of town on the day of the site visit. In that case, the FWL researcher spoke only with the elementary and high school principals. In each district, a range of from two to eight principals were interviewed, totaling 57 principals.

- Teachers: elementary, junior high or middle school, and high school teachers were interviewed in each district. Interviews were held in small groups ranging from four to twelve teachers. In larger districts, as many as six groups of teachers were interviewed. In smaller districts, one or two groups were sufficient for purposes of the case studies. In all but one district, each group included a mix of elementary and secondary teachers. Districts were asked to select for the interviews two types of teachers: those who had positive experience with the CLS in the school, and those who had limited or negative experience with it. A total of 193 teachers were interviewed.

- **Parents:** Parents were selected for interviews who had some reason to know about how the CLS was working within the district, either because they were members of the CLS planning committee or had helped to evaluate teachers as a part of the Bonus, Ladder Levels, or Job Enlargement components. A range of from three to ten parents were interviewed in each district, totalling 43 parents.

Educators and parents interviewed were promised confidentiality to ensure candid responses to inquiries. In fact, all those interviewed spoke forthrightly and thoughtfully about the Career Ladder System in their district. Case data tended to confirm information learned from the phone and mail surveys, with one exception. Teachers in the case study districts reported much more positive attitudes about the overall school improvement impact of the CLS than did teachers surveyed. Following is a discussion of the common effects of the policy in districts. Patterns of implementation that determine the CLS efficacy for school improvement purposes are also discussed.

Cross-District Impacts of the Career Ladder System

1. Redefinition of Teacher Role: District discretion to define new kinds of teacher work is generating a wide range of new work roles. Mentoring, curriculum development and implementation (especially for core and Outcome Based Education planning), special student services (homework hotlines, special at-risk and Advanced Placement courses), and school-community relations are the most common work roles for teachers.

Selection criteria for some positions remains understandably unclear. New role definitions are by their very nature uncertain at the outset. Some trial and error is inevitable for determining the level of professional teaching experience or other special skills needed for these new kinds of teacher work. Additionally, evaluating the quality of teachers' work in these new roles will require clear performance criteria that are just now evolving. As one teacher comments:

> We still have questions about how effectively we're identifying these jobs. We also haven't worked out a [Job Enlargement] evaluation system that we're completely satisfied with. But since the jobs are making our programs stronger and providing students with more help and more AP courses, we're willing to put in the extra time figuring out how to do it right.

Case study date indicate that most new roles greatly enhance school curriculum or management, and teachers selected for new assignments are, in fact, those whose special talents match the demands of the new role. However, there are some roles assignments that may be more appropriately and efficiently carried out by aides or secretaries: clerical tasks associated with curriculum writing, for example, or chaperoning of student travel or other out-of-school activities.

So strong is the CLS policy as a stimulus for redefining the professional work of a teacher that this effect warrants careful attention both by districts and the Utah State Office of Education (USOE). During this learning phase, the USOE might consider compiling an inventory of the types of work now emerging under the various components -- identifying possible patterns of work in larger or smaller schools, elementary or secondary schools, or urban or rural schools. Such an inventory might be useful for districts in establishing comparable pay scales and evaluation measures. It could also help to determine which emerging roles seem most appropriately be incorporated in Career Ladder Level responsibilities and which are best carried out under Extended Contract work.

2. Teacher Evaluation: Legislating systematic teacher evaluation has greatly intensified attention to teacher performance in many schools. Principals generally support the intensified attention to evaluations, but some worry about the need for the instrument to have proven 'reliability and validity'. In the words of one:

> I know this is accepted district-wide by teachers and administrators as the best instrument for our district....but I'm just waiting to be sued because I didn't conduct a 'reliable' assessment...."

In three districts, administrators and teachers reported that systematic evaluation had not occurred prior to the CLS legislation. In two districts, the evaluation instrument used to fulfill the SB 100 mandate differs from that used for the award of Performance Bonuses or Career Ladder Levels advancement. The multiple instruments and different assessment criteria contribute to teachers' feeling that they are 'hoop-jumping' rather than participating in a legitimate assessment.

A skeptical teacher:

> So one day I'm good if I structure 20 minutes of my lesson right....another day I'm good if parents and students have said so....or if I have pasted enough stuff in a so-called 'dossier'...none of which is an accurate picture of my real strengths or weaknesses....all of it takes too great an emotional toll with no real professional growth or even accurate feedback for me.

(Note: In both districts, administrators and teachers hope to consolidate the evaluation instruments and processes. It is possible that by the time this report is published, consolidation will have occurred.) In two other case study districts, local committees of teachers, administrators and parents were struggling to develop a new instrument that all could agree was fair and reliable.

In ten of the twelve districts, teachers report that the new training in evaluation procedures has resulted in a common language about the practice of teaching that teachers and principals share. "I think I am a better teacher as a result of the evaluations. I am thinking more deliberately about how I structure my lessons and how I sequence my units." is how one teacher described the benefits of talking with colleagues about her work. The standardized evaluation instruments most used were variations of the ITC and AIM models. In the words of one principal:

> The evaluation mandate is terrific. Now there's no question they [evaluations] have to be done. A special plus is that teachers in all schools are talking the same language. For me, I can talk about strengths and areas for improvement and still give some rewards for genuinely good work.

In sum, the process is still uncertain or overly complex in many schools and opinions about its benefits remain mixed.

As one principal noted:

> I can't blame my teachers for being a little concerned....frankly, I was, too, the first year I evaluated every teacher in the school. I'm better now than I was then....and thankful for the training that helped me carry it off.

USOE help for districts during these crucial and most difficult first years -- in the form of information about promising practices and training in the conduct of evaluation -- would seem necessary to mitigate the disruptive effects of so charged a work place change.

3. Curriculum Improvement: In every case study district, teachers and principals report that school curriculum has significantly improved as a result of the CLS. These benefits are reported even in districts where educators are not generally supportive of the legislation. The Extended Contract Year has allowed individual teachers more time to prepare for instruction and to expand and enrich their curriculum. As one teacher noted: "I'm able to use more audio-visual materials and outside resources because I have time to plan more carefully."

Job Enlargement has also paid teachers to work through the district and school planning necessary to implement the core curriculum and prepare for the forthcoming standardized assessment program. A number of districts have used the extra teacher time to implement or expand their Outcomes Based Education program. One district was able to produce a training film to use in preparing teachers for the new evaluation. The teacher-video producer filmed teachers who were practicing the exemplary teaching methods that the evaluation was to document. As one principal in that district noted: "We made our own teachers stars of the film by catching them doing it [teaching] right. It made it much easier to convince others that the evaluation was reasonable and focused on the right skills."

While activities tied directly to school and district curriculum goals seem to produce the broadest benefits, some special projects have created new and rich learning expriences for students. For example, one home economics teacher was able to expand her course to include marketing, merchandizing, and fashion design, with a school-community fashion show as a culminating activity. As another teacher commented: "I've taught history for fifteen years. This [Job Enlargement] has been the prod I needed to record all my work so others can benefit from it when I retire."

4. Altered Role of the Principal: In every case study district, administrators and teachers called attention to the changing role of the principal. The CLS has changed principal work in three ways: more work time on preparation, conduct, and follow up of teacher evaluations; new supervisory roles; and new reporting roles. Six districts also report slight concern about recruiting new principals and assistant principals because salaries are now not as competitive.

Many administrators, principals and teachers commented on the increased time spent on evaluation. Teachers and principals generally felt that this was time well-spent. In the words of one principal,

> I'm back in the role of instructional leader in a big way. I've more information about every teacher's classes and teaching styles from three years of these evaluations that I have in the past ten years. Of course, the other administrative work slips through the cracks sometimes...face it, there are so many hours in the day and evaluation has to occur between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m. -- it's not something I can do nights and weekends.

Principals, far more than teachers, recognize changes in their work responsibilities beyond those associated with intensified evaluation. The CLS requires different kinds of supervisory responsibilities with mentor teachers, curriculum specialists, or public relations liaisons, for example. Different reporting responsibilities have also been created as principals participate on or report to district-wide Career Ladder Committees set up to validate CLS operations in the district. Principals generally view these changes very positively. As one noted:

> It [the district Career Ladder Committee] removes me from having to make isolated judgments about whether a teacher is ready for professional advancement. I like sharing those kinds of decisions.

In some districts, top administrators expressed concern over the long-term effects of the CLS on principals if their compensation system remains the same while their supervisory duties expand. The concern is also raised by some teachers and principals. As one superintendent stated:

> Our CLS committees meet late into the night. Teachers get pay for the time they spend. Principals get zip. In fact, I recently hired a principal who took a cut in pay by giving up teaching. I know that, in the long run, that's good for the teaching profession....I'm not sure what that says about drawing the brightest and best into administration.

At least four districts have worked out a local bonus plan for principals or have found additional local funds to award stipends for principals' extra work. Not all districts believe that this change in principals' work warrents increased salary. Many principals consider the work, albeit different, simply part of their overall responsibility for school operations. As such, supervision of the Career Ladder System in the school fits within the principal's routine supervisory responsibilities. These principals are careful to note that work with the Career Ladder System in place is different, but not necessarily new. Moreover, they have far more resources at their disposal -- in the form of extra teacher help -- to carry out the work of the school.

5. Increased Overall Administrative Burden: Many administrators call attention to the added paperwork and reporting associated with implementing the various components of the Career Ladder System. One large district calculated the total costs associated with the CLS at $94,000. They took into account school level phone calls, time for form filling, secretarial and administrator time, cost of paper, and so forth.

These costs to schools must be recognized as another change in the way school systems are doing business.

In districts where the CLS is very favorably viewed, there were far fewer concerns about the additional paperwork associated with tracking new work responsibilities or conducting more teacher evaluations. They viewed the benefits as far outweighing the change in administrative routines. Many, however, did note new payroll costs when teachers receive separate checks for CLS tasks. Some districts limit the numbers of checks to one or two per year to control payroll costs. In others, administrators support extra payments and feel the positive reinforcement for teachers outweighs the administrative cost increase. As one principal noted:

> I think the reinforcement of paying teachers immediately for doing extra work is important. It communicates to them that we value their work and it's vital to the school. I walk in with the extra paycheck and say thanks on the spot.

USOE might document promising practices emerging from payroll and personnel departments regarding how to distribute funds effectively and efficiently and how to track new work assignments and status changes.

6. Urban - Suburban and Rural Differences: In general, rural districts are having a harder time with implementation than more urban and suburban districts. They are disproportionately represented in the proforma implementation category. A number of factors appear to be contributing to the difficulties of rural schools. Added planning and paperwork in small districts with fewer people to carry out the new work associated with implementing the CLS causes some rural districts to only minimally comply with the policy.

Other circumstances that impact schools, especially growth and large class sizes associated with it, shift attention from the CLS implementation. In this case implementation tends to be proforma. In other districts, the Performance Bonus introduces to small, collegial school staff a level of competition and divisiveness that contributes to low morale among teachers and principals. Finally, in some districts, CLS committee membership is viewed by non-committee members as a political appointment of superintendent or principal 'favorites'. In this case, knowing too much about the friendships and alliances in the district works to the CLS's disadvantage. Teachers view the process as too political to be fair.

While the differences between rural and urban-suburban districts are not so great as to warrant differing guidelines, USOE may want to further study rural districts in preparation for the final phase of CLS implementation.

7. Transferability of Teacher Status: Teachers are aware of differences from district to district in pay and status designations for ladder levels and job enlargement assignments. The diversity causes some concern for teachers who may transfer from one district to another and need to translate former work responsibilities into a different CLS plan. The CLS is too new and districts too diverse for any one best Career Ladder design to have yet surfaced.

As it becomes clearer what activities are appropriate for inclusion in the responsibilities for particular ladder levels and how many levels most effectively differentiate teacher status, the USOE may want to establish guidelines for determining a teacher's status when transferring to a district with different criteria for level placement and advancement.

This is not a recommendation for the USOE to mandate a particular number of levels or one set of criteria for advancement. Rather, guidelines might identify criteria for assessing comparability among various levels and work assignments.

District Implementation

Following is a discussion of the circumstances that help to shape implementation approaches and a description of four approaches to implementation.

1. Culture of Policy Implementation: The financial incentive of the Career Ladder System is too strong for any district to resist. It is the only source of additional revenues districts are likely to receive. However, because the policy includes district discretion to develop systems appropriate to local needs, the CLS system varies from district to district. In order to be consistent with legislative intent, local responses to the CLP have to satisfy two conditions: 1) they must be connected to school improvement, i.e. improving the organizational capacity of the school to serve students, and 2) they must be connected to teachers' professional growth and development. In order to achieve the first condition, CLS must be tied to programmatic activities that are logically related to school outcomes -- better educational programs for students. That is, in practice, CLS has to be purposive. To satisfy the second condition, CLS activities such as curriculum development, teacher evaluation, teacher inservice, and expanded job responsibilities must be connected to improving school effectiveness.

Local district responses to the legislation are shaped by a wide range of circumstances that determine how -- or whether -- districts in any way agree with these two legislative intents. Districts may not agree with state program goals. There may be no agreement between teachers and school officials regarding the goals and procedures for implementing a CLS, or schools and districts may lack the technical capacity to implement a CLP.

Generally, local culture -- the attitudes of teachers, administrators, and the community -- is an important determinant in CLS implementation. In some instances, districts may subvert state intent by using career ladder funds to satisfy local needs which they consider more pressing than the state priorities as defined in the CLS. For example, districts may regard CLS monies as opportunities for core curriculum development, but they may not view teacher professional growth opportunities as a priority. Other districts may view the CLS as an opportunity to provide salary increases to all teachers and not see the programmatic improvement possibilities of it. In other words, implementation approaches will vary according to districts' relative emphasis on organizational and/or professional development opportunities.

Case studies reveal that districts do vary in the way they have approached implementation -- both of the Career Ladder System as a whole and of the individual components. Moreover, the variations are not random. Districts approach implementation in one of four ways: proforma, programmatic, procedural, or managerial. Figure 1 depicts the four strategies and suggests their relationship to overall school improvement.

Figure 1 : District Approaches to Implementation: Four Strategies

	Individual Rewards	Organizational Rewards
Emphasis on Adherence	PROCEDURAL APPROACH - focus on procedural regularity and fairness -organizational goals may be secondary or absent	MANAGERIAL APPROACH - vision of policy as as realizing both organizational and professional improvement
	PROFORMA APPROACH focus on paper - adhoc, rules manipulated for convenience	PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH- - focus on programmatic ends - professional growth concerns secondary or non-existent

Emphasis on Realization of Organizational Ends

Each of the 12 case study districts can be classified using this model of implementation. Two districts are currently realizing the benefits of managerial implementation. One adopted a managerial strategy from the first; another has moved to this strategy from previous proforma attempts. Several are using procedural strategies for one or more components. One district uses primarily programmatic strategies. Four districts have practiced proforma implementation for all components.

There is evidence of a strong connection between the type of implementation strategy a district employs and both the degree of administrator and teacher satisfaction with the Career Ladder System and the relative effectiveness of the system as a tool for school improvement. Size is a factor, with rural districts more often proforma, urban more procedural. The learning that takes place over time about the policy's usefulness causes districts to change approaches to implementationn. Case study data provide evidence that districts move from proforma or programmatic through procedural strategies to a managerial approach. This suggests that most districts will realize more fully benefits from the CLS in time.

Managerial Implementation

The two districts employing managerial implementation have established effective decisionmaking processes that create congruence between the legislative intent of the CLS and school and district goals. Decisionmaking in managerial districts can be characterized as inclusive and collegial -- that is, shared but not dominated by either administrators or teachers.

In both managerial districts, a district-level Career Ladder Committee is instrumental in developing procedures for implementing the various components. The Committees are large: fourteen members in one district. Seventeen in the other. Committee members are selected jointly by the Superintendent, principals, and teachers. No one role group is perceived as dominant. These larger groups have subcommittees that review and validate decisions concerning professional advancement in the district.

Data suggests that locating at the district level a team of educators to share responsibility for making decisions regarding teachers' professional advancement communicates to educators district-wide professional standards. In neither district is broad involvement viewed as an intrusion on administrator or teacher prerogatives or controls. Rather, administrators and teachers see the committees as important organizational supports. There is a confidence that the shared decisionmaking will result in fair procedures and good programs for all schools. The committees function as conduits of information between the district and individual schools.

This routine communication though the committee structure helps administrators coordinate school and district efforts. Principals are able to concentrate on instructional leadership in the school.

> Our district administrators have always valued the work of teachers. The CLS seemed to solidify that relationship. They really have approached it as a team. Parent

> It's an opportunity to tap the creativity and ideas of the folks around here....... We're an open district. Teachers can say what they like and don't like about career ladders.... Our administrators are very positive about it....implementation has been work, but not anything other districts haven't had to do....We had a survey about [CLS] this year....92 percent of the teachers are very positive about it. Superintendent

The two managerial districts did not follow similar paths in adopting the managerial approach. One district was able to use managerial strategies from the initial planning stages. In this district, administrative leadership has been stable for a number of years. Already in place were effective communication channels among district offices and schools. Relationships of collegiality and trust between administrators and teachers were well established. That groundwork served the district well.

When the Career Ladder legislation was put into effect, district administrators immediately brought principals and teachers together to discuss the full impact of the policy as it would affect teacher work and as it might further school and district goals. Because the political alignment about who would play important decisionmaking roles was clear, the district was able to focus full attention on the policy's potential and implementation requirements.

The complexities of developing appropriate implementation procedures, though often tedious and time consuming, did not impede implementation. Rather, administrators and teachers viewed developing fair procedures important to professional and organizational ends.

> We've had to change some of the ways we operate as a system -- strengthen and standardize evaluation and bite the bullet on determining just what we mean by excellent teaching -- and it has required quite a bit of teacher and administrator committee work. But it has been worth it. Teaching practices are improving. The core curriculum is better aligned in schools and from school to school, and schools are delivering better education to students because teachers and principals have time to plan the program together systematically....Sure, teachers are getting

> paid more for extra work and for better work, but they deserve the pay ....now we have the resources to get done the things we knew needed doing but didn't have time or resources to do. In my opinion, kids and families are the ultimate beneficiaries. **Principal**

> I've been impressed with our administrators in following guidelines and helping us really benefit from all the parts of it [CLS]....Our initial concern was great, but they handled it beautifully...we really work as a team in this district. **Teacher**

In the second district, the managerial strategy evolved from earlier proforma attempts. Teachers traditionally have had a strong voice in shaping district educational policy and they take pride in the high level of teacher involvement in educational planning. Initially, teachers shared with district leadership a skepticism about the legislative intent of the Career Ladder System. Viewed as a generally unattractive alternative to raising teacher salaries, district leadership "handed the Career Ladder System over to the UEA", according to one administrator.

In this case, the power of the policy to improve teachers' work and school programs proved persuasive. In working through implementation guidelines, teachers and administrators learned the CLS's beneficial effects. Token initial implementation has changed to a growing commitment on the part of teachers and administrators to use ladders, evaluation and extended contracts to strengthen teaching and school programs.

Comments from one teacher group:

> Teachers had lots of input...I'm paying attention to things outside the classroom more....Now I can document what I'm doing for parents and others....It has created a better feeling among teachers - they are being noticed....I think they should put more money into the ladder levels. It stimulates people to do above and beyond....There is a good appeals process....Principals have to come in and evaluate each year. This helps identify problems.

An interesting aspect of this district's plan is the absence of funding for Job Enlargement tasks. Teachers advocate placing expanded work roles directly into the Career Ladder Levels requirements. As a member of the Career Ladder Committee explained:

> We try to keep everything in the ladder levels tied to teachers professional work in the classroom....a job that's important to the school is important to the professional teacher. It should be a routine part of our work..our plan allows teachers to know whether or not they're good...we think 95 percent of our teachers should eventually be on an appropriate level...responsibilities should be greater for the more experienced and proven [i.e. better] teachers.

The evaluation and documentation requirements associated with ladder level placement reveals a strong commitment to a differentiated staffing pattern that rewards excellence and proven competency. The district-wide CLS Committee, which is not paid through the CLS, has earned "alot of trust" from both principals and teachers.

> We are really proud of our system -- our program has been developed and implemented by teachers....we've taken a professional approach to it [implementation] ...we may not be the best, but we're moving forward...morale is up....we've a lot of dedicated teachers...working with us.

It should be noted that in neither district is there full support. Teachers and administrators feel paperwork burdens -- "a little bit of heartburn" as one principal put it -- but they are not overly concerned about added requirements. In fact, the overall impact of the program is clearly one aligned with the legislative intent, e.g. benefiting school programs and teacher's professional opportunities and development.

Necessarily a factor in the successful implementation of the Career Ladder System is the mix of other circumstances facing the district which might serve to aid or impede implementation -- rapid growth with concurrent burgeoning of class size without proportionate increase in routine supports, for example, or sudden changes in district or school leadership. Noticeable in the two districts characterized by managerial implementation are the districts' abilities to accommodate adversity without losing sight of their overall educational and professional goals.

Procedural Implementation

The four districts currently using a procedural approach have adopted it after unsatisfactory early experiences with either proforma or programmatic implementation. Unlike managerial districts which have been able to balance rule development with a broader vision of the programmatic possibilities, these districts are still working out fair procedures that both administrators and teachers believe are appropriate. The success of their system is measured not by better schools but by better rules.

Large size is a major factor in the use of the procedural approach in two districts. Because communication channels are complex in large districts, information about the program has generally been disseminated through routine modes that do not communicate as well the 'uniqueness' of the program -- "It was just another announcement that I was too busy to read....I could have attended a meeting about it but I didn't..." are typical teacher comments. Because the policy can't be ignored for long, teachers' ad hoc information sharing within and among schools about it promulgates uncertainty and sometimes distrust of apparently different procedures and rules from school to school.

"It seemed to me that the principal made sure the 'special few' knew about it....I wasn't one of them...." or "Our principal was pretty good about keeping us informed, but I know that at [another school], they had a completely different picture of who could qualify." are typical teacher comments.

To minimize the "rumor mill" and perceptions of favoritism, district administrators and teacher representatives negotiate fair rules and procedures and focus most attention on communicating the rules. Secondary is the message that teacher participation can expand their participation in school planning and policy setting. Even though teachers and administrators acknowledge overall positive benefits from the CLS, their talk centers around how teachers go about qualifying for various components and how money is distributed.

Principal comments representative of this procedural approach are:

> For teachers it is good to have the opportunity to make more money....teachers are grateful for the money....[but] wonder what hoop they have to jump through next to get [it]." and "I support it because it pays teacher for extra time....but teachers were good before this...the paperwork that they and I have to go through is too time-consuming....at least we've worked out a plan that seems fair.

A teacher comments:

> I know some good things have come out of this, but I regard it as...a necessary evil....it's pay for what we should be doing anyway...but more 'hoops' to jump through to get it...There are some problems with communications. Teachers do not know the

> specific requirements and processes for career ladder....other teachers do not want to assemble a dossier that is still required...it's a waste of time...advancement to a professional level does not mean the individual is a superior teacher...it just means the person qualified by jumping through hoops.

In procedural districts, the locus of control over decisions about how the CLS is to be implemented has changed over time. In most, the policy was viewed initially as an overly complex teacher compensation policy best worked out by the teachers. Early problems negotiating how to put the plan into effect led some district administrators to assume a more active role in overseeing the CLS -- ensuring that the procedures are fair and not fodder for litigation. A more active district role has returned a balance in decisionmaking that suggests that, over time, emphasis may shift from proceduralism to a more managerial approach.

Large numbers of students in overcrowded schools has contributed to one district's procedural approach to implementing the ladders. In this mid-sized district, issues of resource distribution to manage crowded classrooms have primary attention. Morale problems among teachers dealing with large classes are exacerbated by the stresses brought about by the change in their work roles associated with the ladders. "I've always believed in merit pay...but after working with this system, I've about concluded that it becomes divisive and demoralizing." notes one administrator. "Teachers like the money too much....I have to pay to get done what I used to find volunteers to do." notes a principal.

Not surprisingly, teachers view the additional money as a necessary reward for the large class loads, and couch comments about school benefits in terms of paying teachers more to get the job done. "You've got a huge carrot in front of a very hungry donkey here....we need these incentives to take on such large classes...the committee work may be interesting but it's too time consuming....and with 39 fourth graders in my class, I'm just about overwhelmed with my own teaching and grading....I need pay to attend those committee meetings at this point."

One district moved to procedural implementation after initial -- "almost devastating" -- attempts to implement what they perceived to be the intent of the legislation. They replaced the step and lane compensation system with that of Career Ladder Levels. As a district administrator noted:

> We took the green book that was the start of this whole thing and believed it. We didn't stand on the edge. We bet the whole thing....and threw out the salary

> schedule....The problems began with the funding restrictions....many of our teachers were frozen on a step for two years....they lost money with the cost of living increases....we were hurt badly by the fact that the money simple wasn't there to reward the people who had, in good faith, agreed to go with the system all the way.

The lingering effects of the lack of full funding for CLS continues to effect this district. Recent attention to procedures involved rebuilding a salary scale that incorporates Career Ladder funding in it. Fairness in rules and procedures is the primary response of teachers who were "frozen on a ladder level with no pay or incentive for better work for two years...." In the words of another, "Instead of helping my career, I felt like it was over....believe me, I'm paying attention to how this thing is being worked out this time around."

Programmatic Implementation

In contrast to procedure bound districts, those employing programmatic strategies of implementation generally approach the Career Ladder Policy as a tool for realizing school and district program goals without regard to the policy's intent to alter or expand the work of teachers. Teachers and principals can speak articulately about school improvement effects of the policy. However, differentiation of teacher work roles or concerted attempts to identify and reward the best teachers through permanent ladder promotions are not strongly evidenced. Decisionmaking in is often centrally controlled by district administrators or a central Career Ladder Committee dominated by administrative input. This administrator dominance tends to keep the policy goals focused on programmatic ends with less emphasis competing values for teacher professionalism. In fact, one of the districts using this approach has designed temporary ladder levels for teachers acting as mentors or curriculum specialists. "We have three year perches, not rungs" is how one administrator explained it.

Administrators are strongly supportive of the programmatic benefits of this approach, and it is clear that overall district and school program effects are positive. Having extra help to carry out school and district goals is a primary benefit to administrators.

> This has changed our school dramatically....I have an instructional team to carry out our school goals... our scores, attendance, and turnover rates are showing that something good is happening...that's because of the Career Ladder....there is no question that school and district programs are better for it. Principal

> The fact that I can assign a mentor to new teachers has made an extraordinary difference at the elementary level...new means new to the profession, new to the school, or new to a grade-level...all need help...now they get it. **Principal**

Many teachers agree.

> The district training I got for helping new teachers was excellent....we have a common language to talk about our work...our curriculum is stronger by far...leader training has helped me share with teachers why we're good...or what things about the school we can change to be better.

Such program benefits are not to be minimized, certainly. However, one result of this emphasis is less commitment to it on the part of teachers as a professional benefit.

> I see the good things that are happening in the schools and applaud the system....but it isn't keeping good teachers in schools. It's just making the school run better. **Teacher**

Proforma Implementation

In five districts, educators are still grappling with trying to figure out exactly what the CLS policy is and how to implement it. Some of these districts are small, with small administrative staffs. Those assigned to implement the policy are also in charge of curriculum, personnel, and other special projects. The job of designing and implementing the system is a large administrative task. In these districts as in all others, some very positive school and professional development activities can be found. However, dislike of or frustration with the policy outweighs recognition of the benefits.

In some districts, teachers and principals feel the various components -- performance bonuses especially -- served to divide their close workplace and neighborhood relationships.

> When you've lived down the street from a [teacher-colleague] for several years and stop talking about your work because of a silly policy -- that's not a good policy. **Teacher**

In these districts, educators generally view the CLS as a needless diversion of monies from WPU funding. Teachers and administrators view it as an administrative procedure with which they must comply -- minimally. There's a tendency to distribute as much money as possible to as many teachers as possible. The CLS works to carry out individual administrator or teacher goals rather than to bring about district-wide professional or organizational improvements.

> I don't know if what I'm paid for helps the overall school....it does great things for my own class, though. Teacher

While the policy is, in fact, creating positive changes in some ways, teachers see little connection between the isolated, albeit good, projects.

Decisionmaking and information dissemination are localized or haphazardly monitored. In one district, some teachers complained about the unfairness and secrecy in the process of awarding bonuses: administrators reported that they had not been awarded at all! As this suggests, neither administrators nor Career Ladder Committees control the implementation procedures in a way that communicates a vision of the policy as anything but an outsiders attempt to control the way we pay teachers.

ATTACHMENT A

Case Study Protocol

PROTOCOL FOR CASE STUDY RESEARCH

Superintendents

1. You have already given your time to us during the phone interview, so we don't want to repeat the same questions. Since the new year has started, have there been any changes in the Career Ladder System in your district? Are there any additional comments you wish to add?

2. Could you explain the composition of the Career Ladder Planning Committee in your district? What role do you play? Has you role changed over time? How are the other members of the committee chosen? How long do they serve? Have their roles changed over time?

3. Would you make any changes in the funding formula of the Career Ladder System?

Assistant Superintendents in Charge of Principal Evaluation

1. How has the role of the principal changed because of Career Ladders? (How has the work of the principal been modified?)

2. Have there been unanticipated administrative costs?

3. If you make recommendations to the Legislature concerning the future of the Career Ladder System, what would you say?

Fiscal Officer

1. What have the different components actually cost the district? (the information we asked them in advance to gather for us)

2. Have there been unanticipated administrative costs?

3. Does you district contribute money of its own to the Career Ladder System?

4. Has it in the past? Will it in the future?

Personnel

1. Since the inception of Career Ladders in you district, have there been changes in teacher turnover?

2. Have there been shifts in the retention rates of teachers?

3. Have there been increases or decreases in the number of grievances filed?

4. Has Career Ladders affected recruitment practices in the district? (Is it used to attract teachers who might have gone elsewhere? Is it a program of which new teachers are aware?)

Teachers

Remind the teachers that the discussions will be kept in strictest confidence. Encourage them to be as frank and candid as possible and that we would like to hear about both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

1. How does Career Ladders work in your school? (discuss all four components)

2. How do you feel about the way it is working?

3. How has the evaluation process changed?

4. What are the strengths of the Career Ladder System?

5. What are the problems?

6. If you could make recommendations to the Utah Legislature concerning the future of the Career Ladder System, what would you say?

Principals

1. How does Career Ladders work in your school? (discuss all four components)

2. How has the work of teachers changed? How has the work of principals changed?

3. Would parents notice any differences in the school?

4. If you could make recommendations to the Utah Legislature concerning the future of the Career Ladder System, what would you say?

Parents

1. Are you aware of the Career Ladder System?

2. How do you get information about the program?

3. From your perspective as a parent, have there been changes in the schools?

Career Ladder Planning Committee

1. How is the Career Ladder Planning Committee chosen?
2. How has your role changed over time?
3. What are the strengths of the Career Ladder System?
4. What are the problems?
5. If you could make recommendations to the Utah Legislature concerning the future of the Career Ladder System, what would you say?

FISCAL DATA NEEDED FROM UTAH SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR USE IN EVALUATING THE UTAH CAREER LADDER SYSTEM

1. Current adopted budget for the district, with any budget modifications that have been made since its adoption.
2. Detailed expenditure report for 1986-87, showing budgeted and actual amounts.
3. Amounts paid to teachers from the Career Ladder fund -- showing amount paid for each component (performance bonus, job enlargement, ladder levels, extended day contracts, shortage areas incentives). Indicate amounts received and the number of teachers receiving each amount for each component.
4. Identification of local funds used to support Career Ladder costs, if any. Breakdown by component funded through local budget.
5. Identify administrative costs for Career Ladder System -- planning, administration, evaluation, etc.
6. Report of all district tax levies and district.

APPENDIX D

Research Instruments

FAR WEST LABORATORY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

STUDY OF THE UTAH CAREER LADDER SYSTEM
PRINCIPAL SURVEY

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development has been contracted by the Utah State Board of Education to do an evaluation of the state's Career Ladder System. The purpose of the study is to aid the Utah State Legislature in their deliberations on the future of the program.

We would like your views of the various career ladder components. Your perspective as a school administrator is very important to our study, so we urge your participation. Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed prestamped envelope by **Friday, October 2, 1987.**

Your responses will be held in strictest confidence. The coding of this questionnaire is only for the identification of response rates by district. No individual data will be released in our report.

Thank you for your help in evaluating Utah's Career Ladder System.

1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103 · (415) 565-3000

FAR WEST LABORATORY
STUDY OF THE UTAH CAREER LADDER SYSTEM

PART I: The following questions ask about the Career Ladder System as it works in your district. Please **circle** the number that indicates **the extent to which you agree** with the statements below.

strongly disagree [1]	disagree somewhat [2]	neither agree nor disagree [3]	agree somewhat [4]	strongly agree [5]

			Strongly Disagree<--- --->Strongly Agree
	The Career Ladder System is effective in providing ...		
1.	A multiple-level compensation system for teachers...	[1]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
2.	Incentives for good teachers to remain in the classroom..	[2]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
3.	Incentives for good teachers to remain in the classroom if continued for a minimum of five years......	[3]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
4.	More frequent teacher evaluations.................................	[4]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
5.	More effective teacher evaluations.................................	[5]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
6.	A comprehensive curriculum for the district..................	[6]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
7.	A strong instuctional program for students....................	[7]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
8.	A positive climate for learning	[8]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
9.	A positive work environment for teachers......................	[9]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
10.	A positive work environment for principals....................	[10]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
11.	Strong leadership for schools.......................................	[11]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
	The Career Ladder System has helped principals to ...		
12.	Evaluate teachers more effectively...............................	[12]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
13.	Provide a stronger curriculum for students....................	[13]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
14.	Monitor student achievement more effectively..............	[14]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
15.	Coordinate school and district objectives more effectively..	[15]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
16.	Work more effectively with teachers................................	[16]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
17.	Work more effectively with district administrators..........	[17]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
18.	Work more effectively with parents.................................	[18]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
19.	Retain excellent teachers...	[19]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
20.	Share evaluation responsibilities with teachers.............	[20]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
21.	Reward outstanding teaching..	[21]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
22.	Use teachers' professional skills more effectively..........	[22]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
23.	Complete record-keeping and school management tasks more efficiently..	[23]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
24.	Improve the overall school climate...............................	[24]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

__ __ ___

Strongly Strongly
Disagree<--- --->Agree

The Career Ladder System in my school has improved...

25. The overall instructional program.................................... [25] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
26. Attention to students' academic progress........................ [26] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
27. Student achievement .... [27] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
28. Parent support .... [28] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
29. Teacher leadership opportunities .... [29] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
30. The principal 's role as instructional leader................... [30] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
31. The day-to-day operations of the school.......................... [31] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
32. The morale of teachers.. [32] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
33. The teacher evaluation process...................................... [33] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
34. The Career Ladder System should be continued in my district.. [34] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

PART II: The following questions ask you about **the various components** of the Career Ladder System in your district.

EXTENDED CONTRACT COMPONENT

(Additional days added to the contract year)

The Extended Contract Component effectively increases teacher opportunities to...

35. Plan for classroom instruction... [35] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
36. Develop curriculum.. [36] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
37. Participate in professional development activities......... [37] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
38. Take care of critical record-keeping and paperwork tasks.. [38] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
39. Provide additional instruction to students........................ [39] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
40. Communicate with parents.. [40] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

The Extended Contract Component effectively helps principals to...

41. Carry out critical school management tasks.................... [41] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
42. Work more effectively with teachers................................. [42] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
43. Work more effectively with parents.................................. [43] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
44. Maintain a smooth running school.................................... [44] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

The Extended Contract Component effectively allows the district to...

45. Accomplish important district-wide planning and management tasks... [45] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
46. Communicate more effectively with parents.................. [46] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
47. The Extended Contract Component should be continued .... [47] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

Strongly Disagree<— —>Strongly Agree

PERFORMANCE BONUS COMPONENT

(Monetary bonuses awarded for excellent teaching)

The Performance Bonus Component is an effective incentive for teachers to...

48. Remain in the teaching profession.................................. [48] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
49. Care more about the quality of their teaching.................... [49] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
50. Understand better the teacher evaluation process......... [50] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
51. Observe other teachers in their classrooms.................... [51] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
52. Be observed by other teachers in their classrooms......... [52] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

The Performance Bonus Component effectively helps principals to...

53. Reward excellent teaching... [53] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
54. Improve instruction in the school....................................... [54] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
55. Carry out better the teacher evaluation process............. [55] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

The Performance Bonus Component effectively allows the district to...

56. Retain excellent teachers.. [56] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
57. Ensure fair, consistent teacher evaluations district-wide. [57] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
58. Improve the morale of teachers in the district.................. [58] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
59. The Performance Bonus Component should be continued... [59] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

JOB ENLARGEMENT COMPONENT

(Extra pay for school- and district-related work other than teaching)

The Job Enlargement Component is an effective incentive for teachers to...

60. Use their professional skills more effectively .... [60] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
61. Share leadership responsibilities in the school............. [61] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
62. Improve instruction in the school...................................... [62] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
63. Receive pay for work that, in the past, they did for no pay.. [63] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
64. Better serve the educational needs of students............. [64] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

The Job Enlargement Component effectively helps principals to...

65. Accomplish important school management tasks.......... [65] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
66. Improve the learning enviroment for students................ [66] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
67. Improve student academic achievement........................ [67] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
68. Use the professional skills of teachers more effectively.. [68] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
69. Reward excellent teachers.. [69] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

The Job Enlargement Component allows the district to...

70. Carry out district-wide curriculum planning and implementation more effectively.. [70] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
71. Improve communication among parents and schools... [71] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
72. Use the professional skills of teachers more effectively.. [72] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
73. Retain excellent teachers.. [73] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
74. The Job Enlargement Component should be continued... [74] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

Indicate the Career Ladder Component(s) least valuable to your district.
[104] _____ the Extended Day Component
[105] _____ the Job Enlargement Component
[106] _____ the Performance Bonus
[107] _____ the Career Ladder Levels
[108] _____ none are of value

PART III: The following questions ask about participation in the Career Ladder System **by teachers in your school during the 1986-87 school year.**

What percentage of teachers earned pay for work carried out under the Extended Day Component?
[109] _____ 0 - 25% [111] _____ 51% - 75%
[110] _____ 26% - 50% [112] _____ 76% - 100%

[113] How many Extended Days did the district schedule? (circle one)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20+

Indicate the number of days set aside for a particular activity.
[114] Inservice activities and workshops [114] __________
[115] Individual teacher planning and preparation [115] __________
[116] Direct work with students [116] __________
[117] Grading, recordkeeping, and related paperwork [117] __________
[118] Parent conferencing [118] __________
[119] Orientation meetings at school [119] __________
[120] Other__________________________ [120] __________

What percentage of teachers received a Performance Bonus?
[121] _____ 0 - 10% [124] _____ 31% - 40% [127] _____ 61% - 70%
[122] _____ 11% - 20% [125] _____ 41% - 50 % [128] _____ 71% - 80%
[123] _____ 21% - 30% [126] _____ 51% - 60% [129] _____ 81% - 90%
[130] _____ 91% - 100%

How were Performance Bonus dollars divided among teachers?
[131] _____ All teachers who qualified received the same dollar bonus.
[132] _____ Teachers who qualified received different amounts based on a district rating system.

Indicate the amount of the bonus if all received the same amount. Indicate the range of the bonus awards if there was a differentiated system of awards.
[133] $_________ (Single amount) [134] $______ to $______ ($ range)

Did the district offer pay for work carried out under the Job Enlargement Component?
[135] No_____ [136] Yes_____

If yes, for which of the following activities did teachers earn Job Enlargement pay?

[137] Curriculum alignment and/or development [137] __________
[138] Master Learning Coordinator [138] __________
[139] Teacher Mentor or Lead Teacher [139] __________
[140] Summer school teacher [140] __________
[141] Ombudsman or Community Relations Work [141] __________
[142] Career Ladder Planning Committee work [142] __________
[143] Other district committee assignment [143] __________
[144] Student assessment activities [144] __________
[145] Computer or other technology projects [145] __________
[146] Other ____________________________ [146] __________

List in order the two most important criteria used for placement on the Career Ladder in your school.

[147] ____
[148] ____

PART IV: Please **describe yourself** by circling the appropriate responses to each of the questions below. **Circle all that apply.**

[149] How may years have you been a principal? (circle one)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 25+

[150] How many years have you been a principal in your current district?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 25+

What is your gender?
[151] _____Female [152] _____ Male

What is your age group?
[153] _____ under 25
[154] _____ 25 to 30
[155] _____ 31 to 35
[156] _____ 36 to 40
[157] _____ 41 to 45
[158] _____ 46 to 50
[159] _____ 51 to 55
[160] _____ 56 to 60
[161] _____ 61 or older

What is your highest educational degree?
[162] _____ BA/BS
[163] _____ MA/MS
[164] _____ MEd
[165] _____ Ph.D./Ed.D
[166] _____ Other degree

What is the level of your school?
[167] _____ Elementary
[168] _____ Jr. or Middle School
[169] _____ High School
[170] _____ Other

What kind of community does your school serve?
[171] _____ Large city
[172] _____ Suburb
[173] _____ Small town
[174] _____ Rural community

How would you describe the overall socio-economic level of the community that you serve?
[175] _____ wealthy
[176] _____ middle income
[177] _____ lower income/employed
[178] _____ very low income/high unemployement

FAR WEST LABORATORY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

STUDY OF THE UTAH CAREER LADDER SYSTEM
TEACHER SURVEY

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development has been contracted by the Utah State Board of Education to do an evaluation of the state's Career Ladder System. The purpose of the study is to aid the Utah State Legislature in their deliberations on the future of the program.

You have been selected as part of a carefully drawn sample of teachers from throughout the state. We would like to have your views on the various career ladder components. Since we are taking only a sample, rather than asking all Utah teacher to fill out the questionnaire, every response counts. Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed prestamped envelope by **Friday, October 2, 1987.**

Your responses will be held in strictest confidence. The coding of this questionnaire is only for the identification of response rates by district. No individual data will be released in our report.

Thank you for your help in evaluating Utah's Career Ladder System.

1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103 · (415) 565 3000

FAR WEST LABORATORY
STUDY OF THE UTAH CAREER LADDER SYSTEM

PART I: The following questions ask about the Career Ladder System as it works in your district. Please **circle** the number that indicates **the extent to which you agree** with the statements below.

strongly disagree [1]	disagree somewhat [2]	neither agree nor disagree [3]	agree somewhat [4]	strongly agree [5]

			Strongly Disagree<— —>Agree Strongly
The Career Ladder System is effective in providing...			
1.	A multiple-level compensation system for teachers....	[1]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
2.	Incentives for good teachers to remain in the classroom..	[2]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
3.	Incentives for good teachers to remain in the classroom if continued for a minimum of five years......	[3]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
4.	More frequent teacher evaluations.................................	[4]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
5.	More effective teacher evaluations.................................	[5]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
6.	A comprehensive curriculum for the district..................	[6]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
7.	A strong instuctional program for students....................	[7]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
8.	A positive climate for learning	[8]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
9.	A positive work environment for teachers......................	[9]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
10.	A positive work environment for principals....................	[10]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
11.	Strong leadership for schools..	[11]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
The Career Ladder System has effectively enabled me personally to ...			
12.	Teach more effectively..	[12]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
13.	Prepare better curriculum materials...............................	[13]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
14.	Monitor student achievement more effectively............	[14]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
15.	Spend more time with individual students....................	[15]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
16.	Work more effectively with other teachers......................	[16]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
17.	Work more effectively with the principal..........................	[17]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
18.	Work more effectively with parents..................................	[18]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
19.	Observe other teachers in their classrooms....................	[19]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
20.	Be observed by other teachers in my classroom............	[20]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
21.	Be rewarded for outstanding teaching............................	[21]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
22.	Advance in responsibility and pay..................................	[22]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
23.	Complete record-keeping and paperwork tasks more efficiently..	[23]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
24.	Better understand the way my work fits into the overall district educational plan...	[24]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

-- --- --

The Career Ladder System in my school has improved...

			Strongly Strongly Disagree<-- -->Agree
25.	The overall instructional program	[25]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
26.	Attention to students' academic progress	[26]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
27.	Student achievement	[27]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
28.	Parent support	[28]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
29.	Teacher leadership opportunities	[29]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
30.	The principal 's role as instructional leader	[30]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
31.	The day-to-day operations of the school	[31]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
32.	The morale of teachers	[32]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
33.	The teacher evaluation process	[33]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
34.	The Career Ladder System should be continued in my district	[34]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

PART II: The following questions ask you about **the various components** of the Career Ladder System in your district.

EXTENDED CONTRACT COMPONENT

(Additional days added to the contract year)

The Extended Contract Component effectively increases teacher opportunities to...

35.	Plan for classroom instruction	[35]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
36.	Develop curriculum	[36]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
37.	Participate in professional development activities	[37]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
38.	Take care of critical record-keeping and paperwork tasks	[38]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
39.	Provide additional instruction to students	[39]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
40.	Communicate with parents	[40]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

The Extended Contract Component effectively helps principals to...

41.	Carry out critical school management tasks	[41]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
42.	Work more effectively with teachers	[42]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
43.	Work more effectively with parents	[43]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
44.	Maintain a smooth running school	[44]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

The Extended Contract Component effectively allows the district to...

45.	Accomplish important district-wide planning and management tasks	[45]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
46.	Communicate more effectively with parents	[46]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
47.	The Extended Contract Component should be continued	[47]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

PERFORMANCE BONUS COMPONENT

(Monetary bonuses awarded for excellent teaching)

Strongly Disagree <- - - -> Strongly Agree

The Performance Bonus Component is an effective incentive for me to...

48. Remain in the teaching profession.................................... [48] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
49. Care more about the quality of my teaching.................... [49] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
50. Understand better the teacher evaluation process......... [50] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
51. Observe other teachers in their classrooms..................... [51] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
52. Be observed by other teachers in my classroom............. [52] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

The Performance Bonus Component effectively helps principals to...

53. Reward excellent teaching... [53] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
54. Improve instruction in the school....................................... [54] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
55. Carry out better the teacher evaluation process.............. [55] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

The Performance Bonus Component effectively allows the district to...

56. Retain excellent teachers.. [56] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
57. Ensure fair, consistent teacher evaluations district-wide [57] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
58. Improve the morale of teachers in the district.................. [58] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

59. The Performance Bonus Component
should be continued... [59] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

JOB ENLARGEMENT COMPONENT

(Extra pay for school- and district-related work other than teaching)

The Job Enlargement Component is an effective incentive for me to...

60. Use my professional skills more effectively .... [60] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
61. Share leadership responsibilities in the school.............. [61] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
62. Improve instruction in the school....................................... [62] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
63. Receive pay for work that, in the past, I did for no pay... [63] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
64. Better serve the educational needs of students.............. [64] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

The Job Enlargement Component effectively helps principals to...

65. Accomplish important school management tasks.......... [65] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
66. Improve the learning enviroment for students................ [66] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
67. Improve student academic achievement......................... [67] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
68. Use the professional skills of teachers more
effectively... [68] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
69. Reward excellent teachers.. [69] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

The Job Enlargement Component effectively allows the district to...

70. Carry out district-wide curriculum planning and
implementation more effectively... [70] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
71. Improve communication among parents and schools... [71] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
72. Use the professional skills of teachers more
effectively... [72] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
73. Retain excellent teachers.. [73] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

74. The Job Enlargement Component
should be continued... [74] 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

Strongly Strongly
Disagree<— —>Agree

CAREER LADDER LEVELS

(Differentiated pay determined by placement on a particular Career Ladder Level)

Career Ladder Levels are an effective incentive for me to...

75.	Improve my teaching skills	[75]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
76.	Monitor student academic achievement more systematically	[76]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
77.	Carry out district curriculum objectives more systematically	[77]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
78.	Care more about the quality of my teaching	[78]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
79.	Ask for professional help from colleagues in areas where I feel in need of improvement	[79]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
80.	Ask my principal for professional help	[80]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
81.	Communicate more frequently with parents	[81]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

Career Ladder Levels effectively allow principals to...

82.	Reward excellent teachers	[82]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
83.	Improve instruction in the school	[83]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
84.	Conduct more thorough evaluations of teachers	[84]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
85.	Carry out the day-to-day operations of the school more effectively	[85]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

Career Ladder Levels effectively allow the district to...

86.	Retain excellent teachers	[86]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
87.	Ensure a more thorough teacher evaluation system throughout the district	[87]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
88.	Improve the quality of instruction in the district	[88]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
89.	Increase student academic achievement	[89]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

90.	Career Ladder Levels should be continued	[90]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CAREER LADDER SYSTEM

My district followed fair and reasonable procedures in administering...

91.	The Extended Contract Days Component	[91]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
92.	The Job Enlargement Component	[92]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
93.	The Performance Bonus Component	[93]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
94.	The Career Ladder Levels Component	[94]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

My district provided the application forms and information I needed to understand and/or apply for..

95.	Extended contract days	[95]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
96.	Job enlargement opportunities	[96]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
97.	A performance bonus	[97]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5
98.	Advancement on the Career Ladder	[98]	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

Indicate the Career Ladder Component (s) most valuable to your district.

99. The Extended Day Component [99] ____
100. The Job Enlargement Component [100] ____
101. The Performance Bonus [101] ____
102. The Career Ladder Levels [102] ____
103. All are of equal value [103] ____

Indicate the Career Ladder Component(s) least valuable to your district.

104. The Extended Day Component [104] ____
105. The Job Enlargement Component [105] ____
106. The Performance Bonus [106] ____
107. The Career Ladder Levels [107] ____
108. None are of value [108] ____

PART III: The following questions ask about **your specific participation** in the Career Ladder System in your district.

Did you receive pay for work carried out under the Extended Day Component?

[109] No ____ [110] Yes ____
[111] If yes, for how many days were you paid? ________ days
[112] $ amount per day ______ or [113] Total $ amount ______

If yes, indicate the number of days you worked on particular activities.

[114] Inservice activities and workshops [114] ________
[115] Individual teacher planning and preparation [115] ________
[116] Direct work with students [116] ________
[117] Grading, recordkeeping, and related paperwork [117] ________
[118] Parent conferencing [118] ________
[119] Orientation meetings at school [119] ________
[120] Other ________________ [120] ________

Did you receive a Performance Bonus for the 1986-87 school year?

[121] No ____ [122] Yes ____
[123] If yes, what was the amount of the bonus? ________ dollars

Did you receive pay for work carried out under the Job Enlargement Component?

[124] No ____ [125] Yes ____

If yes, indicate the dollar amount you earned for the following activities:

[126] Curriculum alignment and/or development [126] ________
[127] Master Learning Coordinator [127] ________
[128] Teacher Mentor or Lead Teacher [128] ________
[129] Summer school teacher [129] ________
[130] Ombudsman or Community Relations Coordinator [130] ________
[131] Career Ladder Planning Committee work [131] ________
[132] Other district committee assignment [132] ________
[133] Computer or other technology projects [133] ________
[134] Student assessment activities [134] ________
[135] Other ________________ [135] ________

If yes, how were you selected for the Job Enlargement position?

[136] _____ I was recruited for a specific position and was asked to apply.

OR

[137] _____ I submitted an application and selection was based on my application.

List in order the two most important criteria used for placement on the Career Ladder in your school.

[138] ____

[139] ____

PART IV: Please **describe yourself** by circling the appropriate responses to each of the questions below. **Circle all that apply**.

[140] How may years of teaching experience do you have?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 25+

[141] How many years have you taught in your current district?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 25+

At what level are you on your district's Career Ladder?

[142] _____ Level

[143] How many Career Ladder Levels are there in your district? (circle one)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12+

What is your gender? [144] _____ Female [145] _____ Male

What is your age group?

[146] _____ under 25
[147] _____ 25 to 30
[148] _____ 31 to 35
[149] _____ 36 to 40
[150] _____ 41 to 45
[151] _____ 46 to 50
[152] _____ 51 to 55
[153] _____ 56 to 60
[154] _____ 61 or older

What is your highest educational degree?

[155] _____ BA/BS
[156] _____ MA/MS
[157] _____ MEd
[158] _____ Ph.D./Ed.D
[159] _____ Other degree

At what level do you teach?

[160] _____ Elementary
[161] _____ Jr. or Middle School
[162] _____ High School
[163] _____ Other/Special School

What kind of community does your school serve?

[164] _____ Large city
[165] _____ Suburb
[166] _____ Small town
[167] _____ Rural community

How would you describe the socio-economic level of the community that you serve?

[168] _____ wealthy
[169] _____ middle income
[170] _____ lower income/employed
[171] _____ low income/high unemployment

FAR WEST LABORATORY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

TELEPHONE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

My name is ________________________________. I am an interviewer with Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development in San Francisco.

You should have received a letter by now which explained that we are a research organization. We have been contracted by the Utah State Board of Education to do an evaluation of the state's Career Ladder Program. As our letter mentioned, our report will be used during Utah's next legislative session for deliberations on the future of the program.

I would like to talk with you about the various career ladder components. I am particularly interested in how they affect teachers, principals, and district administrators in your community. I think our conversation should last about one half hour.

I know the letter emphasized that your comments would be kept strictly confidential. I just want to reemphasize that -- and I would appreciate it if you would be completely frank and candid in your answers.

Do you have any questions for me before we begin our interview?

APPOINTMENT SCRIPT

Could we set up an appointment to talk sometime in the next few days?

APPOINTMENT TIME: ____

Thank you for finding time for the study. I'll call back (repeat day and time to reconfirm). Good-bye.

1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103 · (415) 565-3000

TELEPHONE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

FOLLOWUP PHONE CALL

Hello, Superintendent ______________________________________

or

Hello, ___________________________________, Board President.

This is _________________________________ of Far West Laboratory. I am calling to keep our appointment to talk about the Career Ladder Program. I know you have a busy schedule, and I appreciate that you've set aside this time to talk with me.

Again, let me remind you that what you have to say will be kept in strictest confidence. So, if you don't have any questions for me, let's get underway.

Let me begin by getting a general overall impression of your experiences with the Career Ladder Program.

1. From your perspective as a Superintendent, (or Board President) what has been most valuable about the Career Ladder Program?

2. What has been the most difficult or problematic aspect of the Career Ladder Program to implement and why?

3. There are five different components to the Career Ladder Program. They are used differently in the forty different districts. For the next few minutes, I would like to ask you about the five different components.

3A. Let us start with the extended contract component. Does your district participate in the extended contract component?

Yes _________ No __________

How does this component work in your district?

3B. To what extent do you think the extended contract component has modified how teachers teach? In other words, has teachers' work changed because of the introduction of the Career Ladder Program into the district?

3C. To what extent do you think the extended contract component has modified how principals and other administrators do their work in your district?

4A. The next component is the performance bonus component. Does your district participate in the performance bonus component?

Yes __________ No __________

How does this component work in your district?

4B. To what extent do you think performance bonus has modified how teachers teach?

4C. To what extent do you think performance bonus has modified how principals and other administrators do their work in your district?

5A. Let us move to the third component of the Career Ladders Program--job enlargement. Does your district participate in the job enlargement component?

Yes __________ No __________

How does this component work in your district?

5B. To what extent do you think job enlargement has modified how teachers teach?

5C. To what extent do you think job enlargement has modified how principals and other administrators do their work in your district?

6A. The fourth component is the Career Ladder levels. Does your district participate in this component?

Yes __________ No __________

How does this component work in your district?

6B. How many levels does your district presently have?

Number of levels _____

6C. Has the number of levels changed over the three years the Career Ladder Program has been in effect in Utah?

Number of changes _____

6D. To what extent do you think the career ladder levels have modified how teachers teach in your district?

6E. To what extent do you think career ladder levels have modified how principals and other administrators do their work in your district?

7A. The fifth and final component in the Career Ladders Program is incentive funding for teacher shortages. Does your district participate?

7B. To what extent do you think the incentive funding for teacher shortages component has modified how teachers teach in your district?

7C. To what extent do you think the incentive funding for teacher shortages component has modified how principals and other administrators do their work in your district?

8. It seems the Career Ladder Program could be a complex policy to interpret to teachers ,administrators, and community groups. I would like to talk about this for a few minutes. How did teachers come to understand the Career Ladder Program? What was the process by which teachers got information about the program? What do teachers think about it at this stage?

9. How did administrators, especially principals, come to understand the Career Ladder Program? What was the process by which they got information about the program? What do administrators think about it at this stage?

10. What do you say to community groups like PTA's, citizens groups, parents, so they can understand the Career Ladder Program? What was the process by which they got information about the program? What do these groups think about it at this stage?

11. This is my last question. If you were given a few minutes to speak to the Utah State Legislature concerning your experiences as a Superintendent (Board President) with the Career Ladder Program in your district, what would you say to them?

TELEPHONE CLOSING COMMENTS

Thank you very much for all the time you've given me. I really appreciate your help with our study. The report will be sent to Superintendent Moss in December. His office will be deciding how to distribute it after they receive it. I hope your school year goes well. Good-bye.

FINAL IMPRESSIONS/HUNCHES